

The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XIII

JUNE 1918

JUN 7 1918

Number 9

Editorial

UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY

633

The Problem of Language Study

George S. Painter 639

Some Facts of Latin Word-Order

Arthur T. Walker 644

**Notes on the Results of the College Entrance Examinations
in Latin**

Nelson G. McCrea 658

Lesbos in the Trojan War

Emily L. Shields 670

Achilles and the Armor of Patroclus

John A. Scott 682

Notes

Similes in Homer and in Virgil

John A. Scott 687

Cicero's Hexameters

John C. Rolfe 688

Three More Notes on the *Agricola*

N. W. DeWitt 689

General Comment

691

Book Reviews

695

The First Year of Greek, Allen (Dickerman); *The Greek Genius and Its Influence: Selected Essays and Extracts*, Cooper (ed.) (Hill)

Recent Books

698

General Index

699

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON AND EDINBURGH

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO,

FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, SHANGHAI

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation
of the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association
of the Pacific States

Managing Editors

FRANK J. MILLER
University of Chicago

ARTHUR T. WALKER
University of Kansas

For New England

MONROE N. WETMORE
Williams College

For the Pacific States

HERBERT C. NUTTING
University of California

Associate Editors

GEORGE H. CHASE
Harvard University

FREDERICK C. EASTMAN
University of Iowa

CLARENCE W. GLEASON
Roxbury Latin School, Boston

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN
East High School, Cleveland

WALTER MILLER
University of Missouri

JOHN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

GILBERT C. SCOGGIN
University of Missouri

JULIANNE A. ROLLER
Franklin High School, Portland, Oregon

BERTHA GREEN
Hollywood High School, Los Angeles

The Classical Journal is published monthly except in July, August, and September. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.65); on single copies 2 cents (total 32 cents). For all other countries in the Postal Union, 24 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.74); on single copies 3 cents (total, 33 cents). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, £15. 3d. each; single copies, including postage, 15. 4d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISEI, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Torii Sanchome, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 5. 50 each; single copies, including postage, Yen 0. 66 each.

For China: THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, 18 Peking Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions \$2.50; single copies 30 cents, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 24 cents, on single copies 3 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Deliveries are not guaranteed within the war zones of Europe nor in other countries where transportation is disturbed by conditions incident to war.

Business correspondence should be addressed as follows:

1. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to LOUIS E. LORN, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. The territory of the Association includes Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

2. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of New England to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

3. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Pacific States to M. E. DEUTSCHE, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. The territory of this association includes California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

4. Concerning subscriptions (not related to membership) to THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be sent either to FRANK J. MILLER, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., or to ARTHUR T. WALKER, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.; from New England contributors to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., and from the Pacific States to HERBERT C. NUTTING, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Fifty reprints of articles will be furnished gratis to authors. Additional copies, if ordered in advance of publication, will be supplied at cost.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XIII

JUNE 1918

NUMBER 9

Editorial

IN PLACE OF GERMAN, WHAT?

As a result of an almost universal antipathy felt in this country against Germany, the study of the German language and literature has suffered a marked falling off in our schools, both elementary and higher. This is due in part to the direct action of boards of education of public schools, forbidding, not alone the teaching of any subject through the medium of German in these schools, but also the teaching of German itself; and in part to the lack of interest among students themselves, who in large numbers are showing a disinclination either to begin this language or to continue its study if already begun.

When we remember the large place which German held in our school and college curricula up to a short year or two ago we can readily perceive that this marked falling off of German constitutes a real problem, especially in the secondary schools. This problem A. W. Burr, professor of pedagogy in Beloit College, discusses in the *Wisconsin Journal of Education* for February, 1918. The solution which Professor Burr offers seems to us so sound that we take pleasure in reprinting his article editorially, with the permission of the *Wisconsin Journal*. Professor Burr, in answer to the question, "In place of German, what?" says:

This is a problem in many schools. Pupils are not beginning German. The high-school student, for the sake of his English, ought to have some other

language. English is so nearly a grammarless tongue that it needs a grammar language as a background, to get the pupil's attention to its form and structure, to its ways of giving meaning to words.

There are the French and the Spanish languages and the Italian. But there are not teachers enough of these languages to go around, and their form and life will not enrich largely the pupil's English.

Why not put in two years of Latin, the key to English and to all the Latin languages of today? Not Latin as it was taught for the sake of some day reading college Latin, but the Latin that will meet the needs of the high-school boy or girl of the twentieth century. Not the Latin that marks quantities and classifies subjunctives, but the Latin that is compared at every step and in every lesson with the mother-tongue. Read "English via Latin in the Eighth Grade," *Classical Journal*, XI, 278. Not the Latin that *must* translate somehow four books of Caesar in the second year, but the Latin that gets two books into fit, ready English, that corrects a wrong English word, a poor order, a faulty usage, just as quickly and as often as a wrong Latin syntax, that teaches from the first day as much about English as about Latin.

Nor should it be Latin that in four years laboriously builds up a vocabulary of 2,000 words for future Latin, but rather Latin that makes one hundred and fifty Latin stems and particles that appear on any page of English, Latin, French, Spanish, and Italian so familiar that the pupil knows them as he does the one hundred and forty-four facts of the multiplication table for his arithmetic and algebra. Eighty-seven per cent of the thought-words of the Preamble to the U.S. Constitution come from the Latin. *Facio* and *sto* easily furnish two hundred English derivations each. The Latin *con* (*com*, *col*, *co*) begins the words of over fifty pages of Webster's unabridged and helps determine the meaning of each word. The prefix *in* (*im*, *il*, *ir*) introduces over sixty pages of words. And this takes no account of the part which these prefixes play in French, Spanish, or Italian dictionaries.

Might not some Latin be time-saving for the pupil and give him the habit of noticing words? The right word in the right place is the best practical equipment for this day of telegrams, telephones, business, and state papers.

The study of Latin today should not be an endless series of memory tasks for the adolescent learner, but the interesting question of "how the wheels go round" to give sense to words in English and in Latin. A "consciousness of language" is the greatest need of our boys and girls. It is not model forms repeated *ad nauseam*, but the looking at *reg-is* as "king-of," and *ama-bi-t* as "love-will-he," reading the construction and meaning from the Latin letters as readily as he does in English from its words.

Two years of Latin will produce this result if the traditional ways of learning Latin are changed. One year can be made more valuable than a year in any other study of the high-school course. It is this practical, useful Latin that may well take the place of some of the German.

**THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST
AND SOUTH**

For the first time in the history of the Association our membership has passed the two-thousand mark. At the time of the annual meeting there were 2,129 members on our roll. The balance in the treasury was \$1,916.02. Last year at approximately the same time it was \$1,963.45. The membership by states is shown in the following table:

State	1916-17	1917-18
Alabama	17	19
Arkansas	19	28
Colorado	39	45
Florida	37	22
Georgia	17	24
Illinois	275	277
Indiana	177	202
Iowa	149	160
Kansas	110	114
Kentucky	43	59
Louisiana	28	30
Michigan	138	157
Minnesota	45	54
Mississippi	18	42
Missouri	95	94
Nebraska	59	79
New Mexico	5	3
North Carolina	14	25
North Dakota	21	21
Ohio	253	253
Oklahoma	24	29
South Carolina	8	8
South Dakota	17	26
Tennessee	54	67
Texas	107	129
Utah	15	12
Virginia	33	42
West Virginia	13	11
Wisconsin	85	78
Wyoming	3	7
In absentia	23	12
Total	<hr/> 1,941	<hr/> 2,129

CLASSICAL CONFERENCE AT PITTSBURGH

A Classical Conference is being arranged under the auspices of the National Education Association in connection with its annual meeting at Pittsburgh. Dean Andrew F. West of Princeton University has been appointed chairman of the Conference and the program is now in active preparation. Two sessions will be held at the University of Pittsburgh, one beginning at ten o'clock Tuesday morning, July 2, and the other beginning at ten o'clock Wednesday morning, July 3. All papers will be limited to twenty minutes. Further public notice will be given.

THE PROBLEM OF LANGUAGE STUDY

BY GEORGE S. PAINTER
Professor of Philosophy, New York State College

For many centuries of our civilization language study was confined to the Greek and Latin as the historic antecedents of our English tongue. But in more recent times question has arisen concerning the relative educational value of the ancient languages as compared with the modern, particularly the French and German. This problem, once raised, has grown into an acrimonious partisan contention, but apparently without any clear understanding as to the determining grounds of the respective claims. At least the debate continues with indecision and confusion. No better evidence of this fact could be found than in two "Occasional Papers" recently published by the General Education Board which take diametrically opposed views on the value of the study of the classics. Viscount Bryce, formerly British ambassador to the United States, writes on "The Value of Ancient Literature to the Modern World," and concludes that the knowledge of Greek and Latin is essential to culture and constitutes a refreshment of spirit in a world full of complexities and alarms. President Eliot of Harvard, on the other hand, in writing on "Latin and the A.B. Degree," maintains that Latin and Greek must be discarded as having served but no longer serving a useful purpose.

The clamor in behalf of the modern languages has come particularly from the ranks of the natural scientists. Their motives have been purely utilitarian. That is, they have cast upon the Greek and Latin the opprobrium of being *dead* languages and of little service in modern education; whereas the modern languages, as *living* tongues, they hold to be practically useful for conversation and commercial purposes, and especially for present-day literary and scientific culture. The classicists, on the other hand, have urged the study of Greek and Latin rather more from traditional

prejudice than from any clear insight into the real superiority of the ancient languages for education and culture; that is, their advocacy of these languages has proceeded from a somewhat vague and undefined belief in their superiority rather than from reasoned convictions drawn from demonstrably true principles.

The strife for these contending claims has been waged largely in the colleges and universities of the United States. The outcome has been predominantly in favor of the modern languages, with a decided lapse in the study of the ancient languages. Formerly preparation in Greek and Latin were the universal conditions for admission to the colleges and universities of this country. Up to about fifty years ago the lectures in the German universities were delivered in Latin in all subjects, and the students were prepared to understand them as well or better than if they had been given in their mother-tongue. The professors of Greek, also, could speak that language as well as they could the Latin. This was relatively true of the other European universities, and Greek and Latin were at that time living languages because of their constant practical use.

In comparatively recent times in our own country the requirements for admission to college have been changed, until at present a large part of the institutions make no requirement of either Greek or Latin, permission being given to substitute French and German as the language requirements. However, not all the colleges have yielded to the current pressure in this regard. Amherst College and Hamilton College yet require Latin as a preparation for admission to those institutions; and perhaps there may be a few others which do the same. It is also of interest to note that a reaction has already set in, and that a greater value is beginning to be placed on the ancient languages as instruments of knowledge and culture. It is significant, for example, that Latin is being required for admission to certain schools of science, notably in the University of Michigan and elsewhere. Thus the natural scientists themselves are apparently beginning to recognize Latin at least as an indispensable preparation for thorough scientific investigation.

In view of these facts it appears worth while to take up the problem of language study anew and seek to determine whether

there may be any fundamental principles found by means of which the prevalent contention may be finally negotiated.

In the first place, we may observe that the study of language is not an end in itself but only a means to an end, namely, *thought and knowledge*. And any language is valuable only as it serves this end. Words are the symbols of concepts, and concepts are products of the living mind; but the concepts themselves are the important things. Likewise the grammatical sentence is only the symbolical representation of the psychological judgment, and the judgment is the universal form of thought in every language. Language, therefore, must serve in an efficient and high sense as the instrument of thought and the mediator of knowledge in order to maintain a permanent position in the curriculum of studies. And it follows that the relative value of the ancient languages as compared with that of the modern languages must be determined by their respective peculiar excellence in this particular.

Language study, like that of all other subjects, results in two supreme values, namely, *mental discipline and specific knowledge*. So far as the mental disciplinary function of the respective languages is concerned we may assume, for our present purpose, that they are on a plane of equality. It would be a doubtful refinement to maintain that the study of any one language, rather than another, results in developing superior mental powers. Perhaps it may be granted that whatever language proves to be the harder to master for the given student would, in the nature of the case, be a severer mental discipline in such instance. And if any given language should in general prove to be more difficult to acquire than any other it might be said to contain greater disciplinary possibilities. But all this would depend so largely upon the individual personal equation and special contingent circumstances that it may be doubted whether any real principle or valid fact concerning the matter can be established.

It is true that many investigations have been made with a view to determining whether the study of the classics, for example, actually results in a superior type of student intelligence. But the results are far from conclusive. Different investigators claim to have found diametrically opposite conclusions. The problem

is extremely complex, and the facts are too uncertain to admit of decisive judgment. But even if it were a fact that the classical students average higher in their general mental attainments than any others, this would prove nothing as to the superiority of those languages for mental discipline. For there is always the possibility that the high-school student who is studying Greek and Latin is likely to be a distinctly different type of mind and person from all others; that is, he is generally one who has before him the vision and purpose of a college course, prompted perhaps by aspiring parents as well as teachers. Consequently it may be assumed that the higher type of mind, the more ambitious student in general, is the one who undertakes the study of Greek and Latin, and for that very reason is likely to be superior in the study of other subjects as well.

Accordingly we may waive all claim to the superior mental disciplinary value of any one language over that of any other. Solution of the problem of language study, therefore, cannot be found in this principle, but decision must be obtained from a consideration of the relative value of the several languages as instruments of knowledge, or the practical usefulness which they serve. In other words, the adjudication of the problem must be made on the natural scientist's own ground—that of *utility*. But in the nature of the case the utility of any language must vary according to the end sought or the character of the purpose we have in view. And in this relation there are conceivably three clearly defined ends to which language study may be directed: (1) the acquirement of a language for commercial or professional use; (2) the acquirement of a language as a means of initiation into the literature enshrined within it; (3) the acquirement of a language for the useful insight it may give us into our mother-tongue in general and into scientific terminology in particular.

PROFESSIONAL USE OF LANGUAGE

Relative to the professional use of a language it is evident there must be a more thorough mastery of it than is usually the case in our schools. If the end be to actually speak a modern language, this would involve personal intercourse with the peoples who use

it; but it is evident that such a use of any foreign language is a negligible end in this country. Apart from a few families who speak the languages of the countries from which they have come there is no opportunity whatever for the average American to make conversational use of such language. The best that can be said for the effort at gaining a speaking knowledge of foreign languages is that, in the nature of the case, it would be a very special education for the exceptional few who might stand in such relation as to have practical need of them. Evidently this could in no wise meet the general need of the vast mass of students in our schools.

The conversational or oral method of instruction is being more extensively used, both in the ancient and modern languages. This is good as a method. But if it be argued in behalf of French and German that they may, as living languages, be practically used, the answer must be that, as a matter of fact, not one person in thousands ever does make a speaking use of them in this country, even though he has gained a sufficient mastery of them to do so, the reason being that there is little opportunity, and without the practice of speaking them the languages are soon forgotten. Consequently for the average person long-continued drill in the speaking of the modern languages is time wasted. On the other hand, the necessity of such accomplishment for the special students who are looking professionally to teach or otherwise use the language throughout life is self-evident. It must also be confessed that a correct speaking knowledge of the modern languages is rarely accomplished in this country because of lack of actual contact with the languages in question. In view of these general facts there can be no dominant reason for the study of French and German in preference to Greek and Latin simply because they are present-day spoken languages. In polyglot Europe there is greater reason for the study of the several modern languages than with us because of actual necessity.

For persons who are preparing themselves for international commercial activities there may indeed be a need for the acquirement of a given language in such manner as to be able to speak and write it fluently. But in such cases it is evident that a very technical training in the practical use of the given language must be

obtained, which is quite apart from such training in the languages as is found possible to give in our average schools. That is, it must be the language of commerce. In general, even in such cases, the ability to *write* the language in so far as is required by ordinary commercial intercourse is all that would be demanded. And again it is evident that this pertains to a very special kind of education, and not to the general need of American students which the schools must seek to meet. For the greater part, therefore, a reading knowledge of the languages, either ancient or modern, is all that is to be desired or even hoped for. And certainly it must be admitted that it is a great advantage to be able to read any of the languages in question. For true scholarship, of course, this is indispensable. The thoroughgoing professional scholar must indeed be well grounded in both the ancient and modern languages, without which he is deficient in the implements of real scholarship. The problem of language study as such, therefore, need not be raised or discussed in this relation.

LANGUAGE AS THE MEDIUM OF LITERATURE

It is evident that if we will understand the genesis and history of science, literature, and philosophy we can do so only by a thorough knowledge of the languages in which the records have been written. No man can be a true historian in any other way. For example, the history of Greek philosophy could never have been written or understood apart from a mastery of the Greek language. The same would be equally true of the modern languages relative to the literature, science, and philosophy of modern times. Thus no one can ever grasp the meaning and full significance of the poetic art of Goethe, or the philosophic conceptions of Immanuel Kant, who has not so mastered the German language as to read it understandingly.

The superiority of either the ancient or modern languages in this relation would depend upon the question as to the relative cultural values of their respective literatures. And comparisons in this regard are certainly invidious. The content and significance of the literatures of these two realms are so different that there is hardly any basis for relative evaluation. Both are supreme within

their respective spheres. The genetic concepts and basal theories of science would be found in the ancient writings, but the more completed conceptions and theories of science must be found in the modern languages. Both the ancient and modern conceptions are so necessary to a complete grasp of science and philosophy that there is little choice or preference so far as the elementary student of language is concerned. And again it is evident that complete scholarship demands a knowledge of both the ancient and modern languages.

It is sometimes urged that ancient literature can be studied by means of translations, and that it is useless to spend the time in acquiring the languages which embody it. This may be granted so far as the average student is concerned, although some must be able to translate, otherwise we would have no translations. But it is also true that modern literature may be had largely in translations from the respective languages. And wherever translations are lacking the ideas contained in any language, if of significant worth, are sure soon to find their way into the current discussions in the English language. The world has become cosmopolitan, and the best ideas of the world are almost immediately disseminated by the daily press and current magazines to the ends of the earth.

It must be admitted that to the scholar a reading knowledge of the modern languages may be of very great advantage in keeping abreast with scientific progress. It is true that now and again there appear scientific works and current articles in French and German which can be obtained nowhere else. But it must be clear that this advantage of the modern languages pertains altogether to the professional scholar and not to the average student concerning whom the problem of language study in our schools is raised. The modern languages, therefore, have no great advantage over the ancient languages in the particular that their content can be obtained from translations, since what is true of the one is relatively true of the other.

The contention that the literature of the modern languages is far richer and more extensive, and consequently offers a much greater cultural value to the student, is irrelevant to our problem; for it is evident that the elementary student of languages never can, in

the nature of the case, read very extensively the literature in either field, and that in both languages the literature is far more extensive than will ever be used by any except the professional linguist. It must also be confessed that in our elementary study of the languages even a fluent and intelligent reading knowledge of them is rarely accomplished. It appears impossible to acquire this ability in the high schools by our present methods, and even in the colleges we meet with indifferent success. This results from our rather superficial prosecution of language studies in general.

Furthermore, no translation of a language is completely adequate. Hence he that will be initiated into the true literature of a language must possess that language itself. But again we must emphasize the fact that the problem of language study concerns, not the ideal of scholarship and the professionalist, but rather the meeting of the practical needs of the average student in our secondary schools and colleges, whereby all students may be best equipped for intelligent living, and the select minds, which seek it, best prepared for prosecuting their respective courses of higher education. Our choice of language studies, therefore, must depend upon those languages which best meet this purpose.

LANGUAGE STUDY AND OUR MOTHER-TONGUE

The contribution which language study makes to the understanding and right use of our mother-tongue is its most vital and practical significance for the average student. The English language is a composite. It is like a river, made up of many streams and rivulets emptying into it. It has appropriated terms more or less from almost every important language. But of these it must be acknowledged that Greek, Latin, and German (Saxon) are the largest sources. A very large part of English words come directly from Latin. And we have only to turn to the dictionary to discover that a large number of words are of Greek origin. All scientific and philosophic terminologies are practically exclusively from the Greek and Latin. But the German or Teutonic languages have, without doubt, been the second greatest source of the English language. So far as the French and all the other Romance languages are concerned they go back to the Latin for their origin,

and are accordingly negligible as root sources of the English language.

And now, it is evident, we can have no clear insight into the root meanings and exact content of the basal concepts in the English language without a knowledge of Greek, Latin, and German, the three richest sources of our mother-tongue. These, then, should form the basal language subjects for study in our schools. It must be clear that the student of Greek, Latin, and German will possess throughout his life an inner penetrative discrimination in the meaning of words, a far more efficient and cultured use of his English tongue, than would at all be possible by the study of any other languages or combination of languages. In relation to the genesis of the English language, therefore, apart from the German, the weight of fact and experience is decidedly on the side of the classics.

But there is still a much profounder reason for the study of Greek and Latin when we turn to the needs of real scholarship. And fundamentally it must be admitted that all our education ought to make toward this high aim. Not all students indeed will ever become scholars and thinkers; but since no one can determine in advance who actually will become such we must provide a scheme of education which finally, in the sifting process that must necessarily take place, will yield us as rich a harvest of great scholars and thinkers as is possible. We have been satisfied with the mediocre and indifferent. This attitude must be ended speedily. The future of the world will be determined by true science. We must, then, make true scientists, without which the nation must take a degraded position. In no other way shall the worthy fame of America be set on high. But scientific terminology, almost without exception, is derived from Greek and Latin. Any student who endeavors to study a science without a knowledge of Greek and Latin is almost irredeemably handicapped; the terminology of his science must forever be vague and meaningless symbols to him, the root meanings of which he never could understand. And if he ever succeeds in reaching the content of the basal concepts of his science it must be by overcoming the resistance of serious obstacles, which must inevitably impede his progress.

To make this matter concrete, consider the science of botany or medicine. The classifications in these sciences can never be understood thoroughly without a working knowledge of Latin. The terms used are almost exclusively from Latin. A true scholarship in these fields, therefore, is out of question without an understanding of the Latin terms which are in constant use. Or consider the realm of philosophy. Here practically all the terms are from the Greek, and it may equally be said that the inner content of the philosophic concepts have no language symbols until the root meanings of the terms are understood, and this is impossible apart from a knowledge of the Greek language. A man can never study philosophy in a thoroughly scientific and profound sense without a working knowledge of the Greek, from which his basal terms are derived. Like circumstance might be shown to exist in relation to biology, physics, chemistry, and all the other sciences. Take, for example, the term "psychology," and as it is derived bodily from the Greek it has no meaning whatever to the uninitiated. But when the student of Greek comes to the term he recognizes that it is composed of the words meaning *soul* and *science* in that language, and the meaning of "psychology" instantly becomes crystal clear to him as the *science of the soul or mind*. The terminology thus *aids* thought instead of *hindering* it.

Since language study is useful only in so far as it mediates knowledge for us, or serves as a tool of the mind, it must be admitted that in the very field of the natural scientists, who have clamored loudest for the retirement of the study of Greek and Latin, we have in these ancient languages a pre-eminent instrument of indispensable usefulness in scientific work and research which is without compare and unapproached by the modern languages. For this reason, therefore, Greek and Latin should have the primal place in the curriculum of language studies, particularly for those who are looking to the prosecution of a college course. And since it is evident that the study of language has as its supreme aim the service of scholarship, it follows that Greek and Latin, as the sources of all our scientific terminology and containing the very germs of all our philosophy and civilization, must in the nature of the case take precedence over all other languages as the instruments thereto.

But in relation to scholarship we must make no limitation. We have already seen that the modern languages as well as the ancient are required for this supreme goal. But because Greek and particularly Latin give us the best insight into the meaning of the English language, and thereby serve all students in the highest and most useful sense, and because the terminologies of all the sciences are almost entirely from these languages, Greek and Latin become the indispensable tools of true scholarship and should have the first place in all language study. And, furthermore, because they furnish the best possible preparation for successfully pursuing a college course and in general provide the strongest preparation for admission to the colleges, since they are the indispensable conditions of admission to some institutions and the best qualification for scientific work in all, we have these added practical reasons for the priority of the classics. From the study of Greek, Latin, and German, therefore, the students coming from our high schools are best equipped for either entering into practical life or entering upon a college career, so far as language study is concerned.

Apart from the professional student in the languages we know it to be a matter of fact that when the student in the schools and even in the colleges has once completed his studies and laid his books aside he rarely looks at them again so long as he lives. For this reason some have hastily concluded that all language study is useless and worse than folly. But not so; for, first of all, there is gained the mental discipline which results from such study, the supremest value obtained by the student from any subject in general; and, secondly, there is gained a working knowledge of the given language, which can be used upon demand, like that of the lawyer who can turn to a statute when he needs it; but lastly, and most valuable of all to the average student, there is gained an insight into the meaning of the mother-tongue which will serve with never-failing usefulness as long as he lives. Language is a tool which he has learned to use, and is a positive possession for all time. It is this usable residuum of language study which is the most valuable result so far as its instrumentality to knowledge is concerned. Consequently it is in this particular that the relative worth of the study of Greek and Latin as compared with that

of French and German is determined. It is the contribution of Latin, particularly, to the understanding of our mother-tongue that renders it superior to all competitors, and of Greek and German only in lesser degree.

PRACTICAL CONCLUSIONS

From our preceding analysis of the problem it is evident that there must be certain differentiations of language study, determined by the specific ends which are to be sought.

First of all, we should seek to provide for a course of language study which would prove to be the most useful to our average high-school students who go out into practical life without further education. We have tried to make it very clear, in this case, that the languages which should be studied are those that will be the most helpful to an understanding and correct use of our English mother-tongue. And in this relation there can be no doubt but that Latin and German stand pre-eminently above all others, since the largest part of the words in common usage in the English tongue are derived from these two great sources. These two languages, therefore, should be required of all students. We should seek to send our high-school students out into life with as good a mastery of the English language as is possible. It is gratifying to know that a greater effort is now being made than ever before to give our students in the schools a thorough mastery of English; and so far as the languages are concerned which are to contribute most fundamentally to this worthy end Latin and German are without compare.

In the second place, we should so provide for language study in our high schools as to lay firm the foundations for admission to college and the attainment of true scholarship. It is evident that students who purpose to go to college should have a more thorough and elaborate training in language, the agency of science and learning, than the students who do not. And since we have seen that almost all scientific terminology is from Greek and Latin, and that a student must inevitably be handicapped who is ignorant of these languages as the instruments of real scholarship, it is evident that all students who are preparing to enter upon a college

course of study should have a working knowledge of the Greek language as well as the Latin for that reason. All such students should have a knowledge of the German the same as those who do not go to college because of its powerful influx into our mother-tongue as well as for its agency in present-day scientific and literary investigation.

But since it is impossible, in advance of the fact, to determine what students actually will go to college, it becomes necessary to provide such a course of study in the languages as will render the best service in general to all students and make special provision for the needs of such as ultimately determine to enter upon the college career. To meet this rather complex requirement, perhaps the best that can be done is to say that Latin and German should be required of all students in the high schools, and that in the Senior year, at least, Greek should be required of such students as are purposing to enter college. It may be assumed that by the Senior year all students have about reached decision as to their immediate future, and particularly as to whether they intend to go to college; and the study of the Greek may thus well be left until such conclusion is made. The opportunity is here offered to the wise teacher and principal to guide the young under their care to right decisions, which they themselves are not wholly fitted to do.

Finally, in the case of those who prove to be especially fond of language study and purpose to devote their lives to teaching or otherwise professionally to deal with the languages as a vocation nothing need be said, for it goes without saying that such persons can make no limitation of the languages they pursue for professional ends. But even for such prospective professional students in language, Greek, Latin, and German alone can satisfactorily be offered to them in the high schools. Their real professional work must be begun in their college course, and naturally must include all the interests of philology and the philosophy of language. In the high interest of thorough scholarship as such all encouragement should be given to such students by providing them with all resources demanded for the efficient prosecution of their studies. But in the case of the professional linguist Greek and Latin must necessarily be the basal subjects.

In conclusion a word must be said concerning the time to be devoted to language study in the schools. The usual arrangement in the high schools at present is to spend three years in the study of Latin and two years in the modern languages. We believe this program cannot be improved, provided the modern language be German, and that both Latin and German be so pursued that special emphasis be placed by teachers on the derivation of the English language from them. In other words, the language study in the high schools should be directed to the specific end of illuminating the meaning and discriminative significance of our mother-tongue. This must be the greatest universal value of language study, and can be easily done in connection with these languages as usually pursued by simply directing the student's attention constantly to the derivation of English words from the Latin and German as they arise in the regular courses of study.

In addition to these two basal languages, as we have indicated, one year of Greek, and preferably two years where possible, should be required of all students who are purposing to pursue a college course. This should be put in the last year or the last two years of the high school. Even one year of Greek should give the student a knowledge of the alphabet, elements, and a select group of root words that would serve as a minimum working knowledge of the language, and would enable him, upon occasion, adequately to determine the significance of the scientific terminology and other words in the English which are derived or coined from the Greek. Three years of Latin, two years of German, and one year of Greek for candidates for admission to college seem to be the best that can be done with our present crowded curriculum in the high schools. This program seems to care best for the interests of the general student body and at the same time meet the minimum need of the special students who are looking to a higher education.

Of course there are special cases which will demand exception to this general rule of procedure. For example, students who are expecting to enter upon professional work in teaching French and the Romance languages must necessarily be given opportunity in such languages, and must probably substitute French for German in the high school. But such exceptions do not alter the rule so

far as the greater mass of the students are concerned. And it is the general student body which our problem of language study concerns more than any other. To make language study practically valuable is the end.

If, then, the conclusions we have reached be valid, it follows that the natural scientists and all others who have been clamoring for the retirement of Greek and Latin in behalf of French and German have gone far astray. Our simple contention is that Latin, particularly, is the most valuable language study to the young people in our high schools because of its unique usefulness in connection with our mother-tongue; and that German alone, of the modern languages, is of great value in relation to the origin and meaning of the English language; finally, because of the fact that scientific and philosophic terminologies are largely from Greek as well as Latin, both Greek and Latin are indispensable for a real foundation of scholarship. All advantages claimed for the study of the modern languages, as compared with the ancient languages, fall into insignificance beside the supreme usefulness of Greek and Latin as giving us insight into our English tongue and furnishing us with the basal concepts of all science and philosophy. The natural scientists themselves are the ones to lose most by the retirement of the classics.

We beg, therefore, to urge upon all teachers and directors of our secondary schools a faithful consideration of the claims herein set forth for language study, with the hope that a surer foundation may be laid for our universal scholarship. If America is to have a profound and genuine scholarship, we can never afford to turn away from the classics as the basal implements of science and learning.

SOME FACTS OF LATIN WORD-ORDER¹

BY ARTHUR T. WALKER
University of Kansas

The one part of our grammars which seems not to be built on collections of ascertained facts is that which deals with word-order. The facts to be presented in this paper have to do with certain details rather than with the larger questions of word-order; yet before presenting those facts I must for two reasons venture an opinion on some of the larger questions. In the first place, I wish to present the facts, not merely as valuable in themselves, but as evidence that the whole subject of word-order needs and will repay a thorough study. How can we trust the grammars when they lay down the larger principles if they do not state correctly the details on which the larger principles should be based? In the second place, some of the facts which I shall present are so bound up with the larger principles that I cannot discuss the facts without expressing an opinion on the larger matters.

Most of our grammars tell us that the subject normally stands first. How do they know? A partial count in Caesar seems to show that about half of his subjects do not stand first; and apparently less than half of Cicero's stand first. Our English order requires the subject to stand first, and I believe that "normally" means only that the English writer is carrying over his preconceived English feeling into Latin grammar. I do not believe that Caesar and Cicero knew that the subject should stand first. The rule may be the best that we can do for pupils who are asked to translate into Latin wholly detached sentences from a composition book; but I believe that Caesar and Cicero, if requested to translate the same sentences, would ask what came before them. Neither Caesar nor Cicero has left us a single completely detached sentence; that is, a sentence not connected with some other

¹ Read at the fourteenth annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South.

thought already expressed or in his mind. Therefore we cannot find out how they would have written such sentences. What we can do is to ascertain the principles which led them to put all words first in their sentences, and see whether or not those principles adequately explain the position of such words as happen to be subjects. So far as I can see, they do.

The grammars tell us that this supposed normal order, by which the subject stands first, is broken into by the "rhetorical order," by which the emphatic word stands first; as if emphasis were the one rhetorical goal to be aimed at. Some of them improve on this statement by saying that the first and last places are emphatic. So far as I have observed, the evidence for these views consists of selections of examples in which the emphatic words do come first and last. It remains for someone to apply the *reductio ad absurdum* by selecting examples to prove that the interior of the sentence is the emphatic place; and this can be done by one who has the time. Two grammars even go so far as to say that the great principle of word-order is that the words were arranged in the order of their emphasis—with the most emphatic first, the next emphatic next, and so on down the sentence; as if any human being had ever talked in that fashion.

But, in fact, if one will check off with pencil and paper all the sentences in a few pages of Caesar, not merely the striking sentences, he will find that the great majority begin with whatever word links the thought of the sentence with that of the preceding sentence, whether the linking word is subject or ablative or verb, whether it is emphatic or not. But when the thread of the narrative is broken, as, for example, by turning to the actions of the enemy, the reader will find the new actor or topic put first to warn us of the break. And again it makes no difference whether the word be nominative, ablative, or verb. In reading such a sentence we do indeed emphasize the leading word; but it is put first to warn us of the break, not in accordance with an imaginary principle that all emphatic words are put first. These two principles will be found to account for the position of nearly all of Caesar's initial words. Occasionally in Caesar and very often in Cicero's speeches emotion, genuine or calculated, leads to the apparent blurting out first of

the important word in violation of the principles just stated; and we may then say fairly that the word is "put first for emphasis."

I do not mean to imply that I think those statements fully cover the ground, or that I think myself able to cover it. Some day someone will read appreciatively Henri Weil's *Order of Words*, will find in Mendel's *Sentence Connection* a suggestive analysis of the relations of sentences and a partial support of Weil's views, and will seriously study the facts of Latin word-order. I think that he will demonstrate that the great principle of word-order is to make the order show the relation of each sentence to its context, and will point out in detail how it is done. In the meantime, unless we note the linking and breaking orders of which I have spoken, we miss the chief clues to the connection of sentences and the chief beauty of Latin word-order, and we fail to estimate properly the genuine occasions when words are "put first for emphasis."

I may add that whoever makes a serious study of word-order will be obliged to take into account the laws of prose rhythm. Even if the details of word-order had been studied thoroughly in the past, what is now known of prose rhythm would necessitate a restudy of the material.

But this paper has no such ambitious scope as I have outlined. It merely presents certain facts about which the grammars disagree or are in error. I did not collect these facts myself. They were collected by three graduate students whom I shall name at the proper places. In no case were the statistics verified by a second reading of the authors studied, so that there may be minor errors. But all the students were capable and accurate, all spent much time on the work, and I watched their progress closely enough to feel sure that their results are substantially accurate. Moreover I have had parts of their results verified by other students.

I. THE POSITION OF ADJECTIVES AND OTHER MODIFIERS OF NOUNS

I read in two grammars that the adjective more often precedes its noun, in another that attributes, unless emphatic, follow their substantives, in two others that adjectives normally follow, though

adjectives of quantity and some others precede, and in another that whichever is more emphatic precedes. It is strange that grammars do not agree on this simplest, most obvious, most easily ascertained point. That statement which distinguishes between adjectives of quantity and other adjectives implies an exact knowledge of facts, is made by the two most recent grammars, has been accepted by certain beginners' books, and, I suppose, is the prevalent opinion. Yet for Caesar, Cicero, and some other authors it is a mistake. And even those grammars which correctly say that adjectives usually precede drop into errors when they descend to details.

In the *Classical Journal* for June, 1913, Miss Elizabeth F. Smiley presented some figures which surprised me at the time. She showed that in the equivalent of four books of Caesar 82.35 per cent of all nouns modified by adjectives or pronouns follow their modifiers. She convinced me that teachers of Caesar ought to teach that adjectives usually precede their nouns. But when I said so to an eminent grammarian he pointed out that Miss Smiley had not classified her adjectives, and maintained that if she had done so she would have found all but adjectives of quantity and some other specific classes usually following. Thereupon I suggested to Miss Mabel Merryman that she take as the subject of her Master's thesis the position of all attributive modifiers of nouns in one or more Latin authors. She studied their position in the entire seven books of Caesar's *Gallic War* and in seven speeches of Cicero—the four against Catiline, the Manilian Law, the Archias, and the Marcellus. Table I (p. 648) gives the most important results of her work. Her statistics do not settle the matter for the whole of Latin, but they do settle what the high-school teacher ought to teach. They take into account neither the frequent separation of the adjective from its noun nor the effect of the rhythmical clausulae.

Notice in the first place that Miss Merryman's results bear out Miss Smiley's. Omitting the participles, as Miss Smiley seems to have done, Miss Merryman found that 80.67 per cent of all adjectives and pronouns in seven books precede their nouns; while Miss Smiley found that 82.35 per cent of all modified nouns in

four books follow their modifiers. In the seven speeches of Cicero, which Miss Smiley did not study, 68.52 per cent of all adjectives and

TABLE I
POSITION OF ATTRIBUTIVE MODIFIERS OF NOUNS

MODIFIERS	CAESAR, B.G., i-vii		CICERO, 7 SPEECHES	
	Precede	Follow	Precede	Follow
Adjectives:				
Quantity, size.....	1,048	99	435	89
Relative position.....	291	35	88	13
Time.....	70	3	39	8
Cardinals.....	216	187	66	7
Ordinals.....	99	37	7	6
Distributives.....	33	3	2	0
<i>alius, alter, illius, nullus</i>	125	10	75	6
Proper adjectives.....	40	22	16	25
Miscellaneous.....	375	157	378	232
Totals.....	2,297	553	1,106	386
Stereotyped phrases.....	20	151	1	269
Totals.....	2,317	704	1,107	655
Pronominal Adjectives:				
Possessive.....	238	111	231	181
Demonstrative.....	640	4	486	28
<i>ipse</i>	29	3	26	32
Relative.....	123	0	39	0
Interrogative.....	51	0	57	0
Indefinite.....	61	7	46	19
Totals.....	1,142	125	885	260
Attributive Participles.....	68	300	30	148
Genitive, Miscellaneous*.....	695	977	406	521
Phrases:				
Adjective, noun, genitive.....	163	61
Adjective, genitive, noun.....	124	61
Genitive, adjective, noun.....	14	8
Monosyllabic preposition, adjective, noun.....	624
Adjective, preposition, noun.....	118	39 to 319 of the other two orders
Preposition, noun, adjective.....	94

* Excluding genitives of demonstrative and relative pronouns, which more often precede, genitive with *causa*, which always precedes, and stereotyped phrases, which usually follow.

pronouns precede. If Cicero had not been so fond of *res publica* and *di immortales* the percentage would have been considerably greater.

Everyone knows that pronouns usually precede, in the mass; and stereotyped combinations like *res publica* are well recognized.

If we omit these and consider only the first totals in the table, 80.31 per cent of Caesar's adjectives precede, and 74.13 per cent of Cicero's; i.e., four out of five adjectives in Caesar, three out of four in Cicero, stand in the English order.

But Miss Smiley did not classify her adjectives, and thus left a loophole for those who maintain that all but certain kinds of adjectives normally follow. Miss Merryman tried every classification that seemed worth while. The classes given in the table are the most important. It will be seen that adjectives and pronouns of virtually every class more often precede their nouns. Some are more likely to precede than others; but, classify as you will, there is no remnant that usually follows. The group called "miscellaneous" in the table is the remnant left after deducting all the preceding classes and, of course, the stereotyped phrases.

It should be added that Miss Merryman's thesis does not merely give the totals for the classes which appear in the table. For most classes she gives the figures for each word. I do not think that the totals conceal any word which more often follows. For example, not only indefinites as a class, but every individual indefinite more often precedes. Some grammars say that *quidam* follows; but it precedes 6 times in Caesar, follows twice; precedes 23 times in Cicero, follows 6 times.

To the general statement that adjectives and pronouns more often precede their nouns there are only three exceptions, and they are apparent rather than real.

1. In most of the stereotyped phrases, like *res publica*, the adjective follows. But these do not form a class by either meaning or form. They are virtually compound nouns. Those included here are: *aes alienum*, *civis Romanus*, *consul designatus*, *di immortales*, *latus apertum*, *navis longa*, *ora maritima*, *pontifex maximus*, *patres conscripti*, *populus Romanus*, *res familiaris*, *res frumentaria*, *res militaris*, *res publica*, *se suaque omnia*, *dextrum cornu*, *nova res*, *novissimum agmen*, *sinistrum cornu*.

2. Proper adjectives more often follow in Cicero. But this includes chiefly such combinations as *Plato Atheniensis*, where one might fairly call *Atheniensis* an appositive noun.

3. *Ipse* more often follows in Cicero. But this is because such combinations as *ea ipsa* are included, though no one can say which word is substantive, which adjective. Cicero, like Caesar, preferred *ipse Alexander* to *Alexander ipse*, though his preference is not as strong.

Miss Merryman found that attributive participles more often follow, no doubt because of their verbal nature. I believe that the grammars do not mention this fact and I feel justified in excluding them from the discussion of adjectives.

To test the validity of these results elsewhere in Latin, Miss Merryman studied two books of the *Aeneid* and Miss Mignonette Spilman studied Livy xxi, *De senectute*, and the *Captives* of Plautus. In the *Aeneid* adjectives and pronouns of every single class more often precede. The same is true of the other works mentioned, with the following exceptions:

1. Proper adjectives more often follow in the *De senectute* for the same reason as in the speeches of Cicero, but they more often precede in Livy.
2. Possessives more often follow in the *De senectute* and in Livy, but they more often precede in the *Captives*.
3. *Ipse* more often follows in the *De senectute* for the same reason as in the speeches of Cicero, but it more often precedes in Livy, and is evenly balanced in the *Captives*.
4. Miscellaneous adjectives more often follow in the *Captives*, only 42 per cent of them preceding; but 61 per cent of them precede in the *De senectute* and 67 per cent of them in Livy.

Attributive genitives are more evenly balanced. Of the total number both Caesar and Cicero make a small majority precede. But the genitive with *causa* always precedes; so do the genitives of the interrogative and relative pronouns. The genitive of other pronouns usually precedes, just as pronominal adjectives do. On the other hand, in most stereotyped phrases, like *milia passuum* and *tribunus militum*, the genitive follows. Excluding these classes the genitive more often follows in both authors—about 58 per cent following in Caesar, 56 per cent in Cicero. Similar results were obtained in the study of the *De senectute*, the *Captives*, and the parts of Vergil and Livy that were read.

Doubtless many of us have been misled by the statement made in three grammars and in several composition books that when a noun is modified by both an adjective and a genitive the usual order is adjective, genitive, noun. The formula sticks in the memory, and there are plenty of examples to establish it in the mind of one who relies on impressions. But it is not the usual order. The more common order is adjective, noun, genitive, with adjective, genitive, noun only a good second. At any rate, this is the case in Caesar (163 to 124), in the *De senectute* (28 to 13), and in Livy (87 to 35). In Cicero's speeches there are 61 of each. A bad third is the order genitive, adjective, noun, which occurs 14 times in Caesar and 8 times in Cicero's speeches. As should be expected, it occurs chiefly when the genitive is a relative, an interrogative, or a demonstrative referring to something in the preceding sentence. The order genitive, noun, adjective, which reverses the usual position of both modifiers, seems to occur but once in Caesar and twice in Cicero's speeches.

Another misleading statement is to the effect that a monosyllabic preposition often stands between an adjective or pronoun and its noun. The statement is true, since "often" is an elastic word; but why make it without adding that another order is more than five times as common? I am sure that many a student gets the wrong impression. In Caesar there are 836 phrases consisting of a monosyllabic preposition, an adjective or a pronoun, and a noun. Of these, 118, or about one in seven, have the order adjective, preposition, noun; while 624, or more than five in seven, have the order preposition, adjective, noun; and 94 have the order preposition, noun, adjective. In Cicero's speeches the order adjective, preposition, noun occurs only 39 times to 319 of the others, or about one time in nine. Because dissyllabic prepositions also sometimes stand between the adjective and the noun Miss Spilman counted the combinations with all prepositions, finding 6 to 89 in the *De senectute*, 3 to 124 in Livy xxi, 6 to 51 in the *Captives*. The facts are that the usage is confined very largely to the four prepositions *cum*, *de*, *ex*, and *in*; that even with them it occurs less than half the time; that only relatives and interrogatives commonly precede the preposition; and that virtually the only

other adjectives which precede are demonstratives, *alius*, *alter*, *ullus*, and *nullus*, the smaller cardinals, and a few common adjectives of quantity, chiefly *magnus*, *omnis*, and *reliquus*. The only times when one should encourage writing the order adjective, preposition, noun are: first, when the adjective is a relative or interrogative; and secondly, in a few common phrases like *magno cum periculo, his de causis*, and *altera ex parte*.

Miss Merryman did not make a complete study of the effect of emphasis on the position of the adjective, but she did note many instances of the emphatic adjective following its noun. When a serious study of word-order is made I venture the prediction that it will dispose of the notion that the adjective is put first for emphasis. That notion seems to be an offshoot of the untenable theory that all Latin sentences are toboggan slides—a notion possibly supported by a count of emphatic adjectives which shows that the majority precede. That may well be the case without proving anything. Since about four out of five of Caesar's adjectives precede, it would be strange if the majority of his emphatic adjectives did not. But how can anyone maintain that an adjective can be made emphatic by being put in its usual place? My guess is that a larger proportion of following adjectives are emphatic than of preceding.

In this detail, as elsewhere, we have been thinking too much about emphasis. Other factors enter into the problem. One need not go beyond the first sentence in the first speech against Catiline to see that the rhythmical clausulae must be taken into account. Why did Cicero write *patientiā nostrā* instead of *nostrā patientiā*? Not, I feel sure, because *nostrā* is unemphatic, but because *patientiā nostrā* gave him a favorite clausula. If the same words had been nominative he would not have used *patientiā nostrā* at the end of his sentence, whatever else he might have done, because that would have given him the abhorred heroic clausula.

II. THE INCLOSING ORDER OF SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

I believe that no grammar clearly and definitely states the fact that subordinate clauses usually begin with the connective and close with the verb, the connective and verb thus serving the

purpose of commas or parentheses. Some of them do make a similar but untrue statement about phrases. They do commonly say that the connective usually stands first, and no doubt their authors feel that they have sufficiently covered the position of the verb by saying that it usually stands at the end of both clauses and sentences. Either they have not noticed or they do not think it worth saying that the verb is very much more likely to stand at the end of a clause than of a sentence.

Apparently this inclosing order of subordinate clauses was needed for clearness in the absence of punctuation. I therefore suggested to Miss Florence Hale, as her Master's thesis, that she find out to what extent some of the Latin writers employed it and consider the reasons for such exceptions as she might find. She read Books i and ii of Caesar's *Gallic War*, the first two speeches against Catiline, and the *De senectute*, and she got much more out of the subject than I can state here. Her chief results are given in Table II. In Caesar she found less than 16 per cent of exceptions, in Cicero's speeches less than 19 per cent, but in the *De senectute* more than 37 per cent. I must admit that the percentage of exceptions is large, especially in the *De senectute*. Even so the rule works better than some of those laid down in the grammars. But a further examination of the facts will show that by providing for the exception of two classes of clauses we can make the rule work much better.

Let us examine first the exceptions at the beginning of clauses; i.e., the instances in which one or more words of the clause precede the connective. The table shows that most of these exceptions occur in subordinate clauses which stand first in the sentence. Of other clauses less than one in fifty is an exception; but of initial clauses, by Miss Hale's count, nearly one-half are exceptions. Therefore in laying down the general rule we must add that exceptions are very frequent at the beginning of sentences.

Why this difference? In the first place Miss Hale herself believes that she counted too many exceptions. In *Caesar cum pervenisset castra posuit*, Caesar is the common subject of *pervenisset* and *posuit*. If we call it, with some grammars, the subject of *pervenisset*, the clause *Caesar cum pervenisset* is an exception;

but if, with other grammars, we call it the subject of *posuit*, the clause *cum pervenisset* is not an exception. Miss Hale counted all such cases as exceptions to avoid the suspicion of making out

TABLE II*

INCLOSING ORDER OF SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

	Total of Subordinate Clauses	Total of Exceptions	Per- centage
Caesar, <i>B.G.</i> i and ii.....	812	126	15.5
Cicero, <i>Cat.</i> i and ii.....	413	78	18.8
Cicero, <i>De sen.</i>	430	161	37.4

EXCEPTIONS AT THE BEGINNING OF CLAUSES

	Total of Initial Clauses	Exceptions in Initial Clauses	Per- centage	Total of Other Clauses	Exceptions in Other Clauses	Per- centage
Caesar.....	153	66	43.1	659	13	2.0
Cic. <i>Cat.</i>	77	36	46.7	336	1	0.3
<i>De sen.</i>	59	32	54.2	371	12	3.2

EXCEPTIONS AT THE END OF CLAUSES, WITH CORRESPONDING DATA FOR
MAIN CLAUSES FOR COMPARISON

	Total of Subordinate Clauses	Verb Not at End	Per- centage	Total of Main Clauses	Verb Not at End	Per- centage
Caesar.....	812	50	6.1	496	73	14.7
Cic. <i>Cat.</i>	413	42	10.1	445	146	32.8
<i>De sen.</i>	430	123	28.6	557	267	47.9

EXCEPTIONS IN CLAUSES WHOSE VERB IS "SUM"

	Total of Subordinate Clauses	Verb Not at End	Per- centage	Total of Main Clauses	Verb Not at End	Per- centage
Caesar.....	48	18	37.5	28	26	92.8
Cic. <i>Cat.</i>	29	19	65.5	33	26	78.7
<i>De sen.</i>	82	31	37.8	88	59	67.0

EXCEPTIONS AT THE END OF CLAUSES WHOSE VERB IS NOT "SUM"

	Total of Subordinate Clauses	Verb Not at End	Per- centage	Total of Main Clauses	Verb Not at End	Per- centage
Caesar.....	764	32	4.2	468	47	10.0
Cic. <i>Cat.</i>	384	23	6.0	412	120	29.1
<i>De sen.</i>	348	92	26.5	469	208	44.3

* This table supports the rule that subordinate clauses (not including infinitive clauses) begin with the connective and close with the verb.

too good a case for the rule. If such clauses had not been so counted the percentage of exceptions would have been reduced materially.

But even then there would have been many more exceptions at the beginning of initial clauses than elsewhere. The reason for this is that the principles which ordinarily govern the choice of the first word in the sentence have their usual effect. To demonstrate this I should have to discuss each sentence in turn. I must content myself with saying that in Caesar the words which precede the connective are chiefly linking words and words introducing a new topic, with an occasional merely emphatic word; and in Cicero they are chiefly linking, emphatic, and contrasting words.

A statement which is very commonly made would explain many of these exceptions if it were true; but it is not. In its simplest form, and the only form that has any semblance of truth, it is that when the subordinate clause stands first and has the same subject as the main clause this common subject stands first, followed by the subordinate clause. *Caesar cum pervenisset castra posuit* is an example. Sometimes this statement is amplified and we are told that a common object, or a common syntactical factor, or a common element of thought stands first. Still worse, some of these statements assert or imply that the presence of a common factor has some influence in causing the subordinate clause to precede the main clause. For example, my favorite college manual of composition makes this most unfortunate statement: "When the same person or thing is referred to in both the main and the subordinate clause, this subject of discourse should be placed first, with the subordinate clause immediately following." Now in the first place the presence of a common factor has no effect whatever on the position of the subordinate clause. That clause stands where the thought makes it stand. In the second place, even when the subordinate clause stands before the main clause, a common subject is the only common factor which stands first in the majority of examples. In the third place, even a common subject never stands first because it is a common subject; common subjects and other common factors stand first only when other words would stand first. In the Latin studied by Miss Hale a common subject stands first 73 times, but it stands within one of the clauses 84 times. A common object stands first 6 times, but within one of the

clauses 10 times. No other common factor comes as near following the supposed rule. If one takes into account only sentences in which the subordinate clauses precede the main clauses, 73 common subjects stand first, while only 31 stand within one of the clauses; and this proportion may be held to substantiate the rule. Of common objects 6 stand first; but 8 stand within one of the clauses. I cannot take space to substantiate my third statement that when a common subject does stand first it does so in obedience to the usual principles of word-order; but it is based on an examination of all the examples. It must be remembered that many words which are not common factors precede the connective at the beginning of sentences. Miss Hale and I agree that the common factors and the other words stand first for precisely the same reasons. If this is true, then even the statement that when the subordinate clause precedes the common subject stands first, though true in a majority of sentences, is, not merely unnecessary, but misleading, because it gives the impression that another special principle of word-order comes into play in such sentences.

There remain for consideration the clauses in which the verb does not stand at the end. As this is the half of the rule which the grammars, so far as I have noticed, do not state, it must first be shown that the verb does in fact more often stand at the end of subordinate clauses than of simple sentences and main clauses. The third set of figures in Table II shows that the verb fails to stand at the end of a main clause about two and a half times oftener in Caesar, more than three times in Cicero's speeches, and one and two thirds times in the *De senectute*.

The verb *sum* is a recognized exception to the general rule that verbs more often stand at the end. The fourth set of figures in Table II shows two things: that the position of *sum* is affected by the general principle of which I am speaking, and that a large proportion of the exceptions to the principle are in clauses whose verb is *sum*. The figures are for *sum* alone, not including the instances of its use in compound tenses. It will be seen that *sum* fails to stand at the end in main clauses nearly twice as often as in subordinate clauses. This shows the working of the principle. Yet there is a total of 68 exceptions in subordinate clauses. This

shows that in laying down the general rule we must add that the verb *sum* frequently fails to stand at the end of subordinate clauses.

The final set of figures in Table II shows how the rule works when we omit clauses whose verb is *sum*. A rule of word-order with only 4.2 per cent of exceptions in Caesar and 6 per cent in Cicero's speeches is remarkably accurate.

I could give reasons for some of those exceptions, but not for all. Sometimes the antecedent of a relative is put after the verb for closer linking. No doubt emphasis occasionally plays a part. I feel quite sure that in a few of Cicero's exceptions the rhythmical clausulae are the cause. I do not know why the *De senectute* yields so many exceptions, nor do I know what the study of other authors may show. But I think that the teacher of Caesar and Cicero may teach the inclosing order of subordinate clauses as a help in both the reading and the writing of Latin. And I think it may be taught as the least violated of all general principles of word-order, excepting only the beginning of initial clauses and the end of *sum* clauses.

NOTES ON THE RESULTS OF THE COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS IN LATIN¹

BY NELSON G. McCREA
Columbia University

In one of my favorite books, especially in connection with my study of Vergil, *John Inglesant*, by J. Henry Shorthouse, there occurs the following passage:

The difference between Johnny's former master and his present one was that between a theorist and dreamer, and a statesman and man of the world and critical student of human nature. The Father made Johnny read with him every day, and by his wealth of learning and acquaintance with men and foreign countries made the reading interesting in the highest degree. In this way he read the classics, making them, not dead schoolbooks, but the most human utterances that living men ever spoke; and while from these he drew illustrations of human life when reading Plato—which he did every day—he led his pupil to perceive, as he did more fully when he grew older, that wonderful insight into the spiritual life and spiritual distinctions which even Christianity had failed to surpass. He led him, step by step, through that noble resolve by which Socrates—at frightful odds, and with all ordinary experience against him—maintains the advantage to be derived from truth. . . . He read to him Aristophanes, pointing out in him the opposing powers which were at work in the Hellenic life as in the life of every civilized age. He did not conceal from him the amount of right there is on the popular side of plain common sense, nor the soundness of that fear which hesitates to overthrow the popular forms of truth, time-honoured and revealed, which have become in the eyes of the majority, however imperfect they really may be, the truth itself . . . and he showed him how it might be possible, and even the best thing for mankind, that Socrates should die, though Socrates at that moment was the noblest of mankind: as, afterwards, though for a different reason, it was expedient that a nobler than Socrates should die for the people—nobler, that is, in that he did what Socrates failed in doing, and carried the lowest of the people with him to the ethereal gates.

¹ A paper read at the thirteenth annual meeting of the Classical Association of New England, at Loomis Institute, Windsor, Conn., March 23, 1918.

Those who have read this fascinating romance will recall that the hero was from early youth trained with the utmost care to play a particular rôle in the political and religious life of his times. The boy was to become an effective instrument in the realization of a great purpose, and to this end the classics and, above all, Plato were used to inform his mind and character. Literature was studied, not for its beauty of form and phrase, but to bring him under the sway of noble ideas, nobly and therefore persuasively expressed, and to enlarge his sympathetic comprehension of the many-sidedness of human life. In brief, the function of the classics in the education of this boy was wholly practical, to make of him an accomplished and broad-minded man of the world, who, because he was by instinct and training a gentleman, might be everywhere an acceptable mediator and by the charm of his manner and conversation win support for the party that he represented. *In mores abeunt studia:* this is an ancient idea which experience abundantly confirms. One recalls, for example, that the course in the classics at Oxford which is known as *Litterae Humaniores* rests upon this same belief in the formative power of ideas. It is essentially a course in Greek and Roman thought, not simply in literature as a fine art. It has in view, not so much the acquisition of knowledge, however valuable this may be, as the development of a habit of mind indispensable in business, in the professions, in government—in a word, in all civilized human intercourse. For no civilization, no cultivation, is possible except in so far as the minds of men can be brought to enjoy the constant companionship of ideas, and to prefer the guidance of reason to that of personal likes and dislikes. But in the life of the individual, as of the race, genuine civilization is a plant of very slow growth. As the late Professor James R. Wheeler, himself a fine example of his belief, once admirably said:

Culture is really the blossom which grows from the seed of knowledge—the seed which has germinated in the atmosphere of experience and reflection. Sought after as an end in itself it is an empty thing, and when I hear people asking specifically for "cultural courses," I generally suspect that what they truly need is something like shopwork. Surely the idea of liberal education goes much deeper than this. It is a very old idea, and it is profoundly ethical in nature, having to do with what Aristotle has called a *έξις ψυχής*, a spiritual condition, which grows out of the direction and quality of our mental activity,

and which determines our way of looking at things. The man who has fully grasped it will have soberness and righteousness and wisdom, and, like that great poet of antiquity, he will "see life steadily and see it whole."¹

In this connection it may be noted that Matthew Arnold's oft-quoted dictum that conduct is three-fourths of life falls short of the ancient Greek estimate. It would be more nearly correct to say that by the Greeks the whole of life was regarded as a fine art and that the ethical motive was felt to be an element in all its activities.

In the great era of reconstruction, both physical and spiritual, that must follow the present war what shall be the function of classical teaching? Greek and Latin have, we firmly believe, a many-sided usefulness. The study of either, and, better still, of both, can and does, if properly pursued, train the mind in orderly processes of observation and clear reasoning. It can and does, if properly pursued, lead to a more adequate understanding of modern civilization through familiarity with the historical antecedents of this civilization. But I think that we shall fail to avail ourselves of the greatest opportunity ever offered to classicists if we do not in the years now before us do everything that is humanly possible to bring home to the minds of our students the ethical significance of the great classical authors. Now and hereafter all thinking about the progress of mankind must take into account the ominous fact that the greatest and most brutal war in recorded history came in an age distinguished far beyond all others by scientific research and scientific discovery.

In Germany, indeed, as her apologists have justly pointed out, almost every form of public and private activity had become imbued with the spirit of the laboratory. Never before was there such determined, multifarious, and successful effort to advance the boundaries of knowledge and to make new discoveries contribute at once to the material welfare of a nation. In the development of the purely intellectual power thus strikingly displayed in Germany the classics seem to have played a noteworthy part. In the introduction to his recent book, *A Defence of Classical Education*,

¹ "The Idea of a College and of a University," *Columbia University Quarterly* (December, 1907), p. 4.

Mr. R. W. Livingstone has called attention to two facts: "(1) The makers of the greatness of modern Germany are the generations educated before 1900; the vast majority of these were educated in the classical *gymnasium* with its compulsory Latin and Greek. (2) Even in 1911, of over 400,000 boys receiving secondary education in Germany, 240,000 were at schools in which Latin is compulsory, and 170,000 of these at schools where Greek is compulsory also." Mr. Livingstone cites these facts to prove the efficacy of the classics in mental training, in the development of the ability to understand and solve scientific problems. Inasmuch as no sensible man can call in question the value of knowledge and intelligence, these facts must be gratifying to us.

But the present war and the multitudinous discussions which have accompanied its progress have raised again the old, old question whether mankind can work out its salvation through knowledge and intelligence alone. For we are confronted by an obvious fact, though many persons are still so childlike in their mentality that they cannot see it. If A (who is anyone) is determined to force upon B (who is anyone else) a philosophy and ordering of life that are abhorrent to B, then B, in so far as he is a real man, and not, as I once heard a well-known publicist called, a "stuffed shirtfront," must fear and fight A as a person whose power to do deadly harm is in direct proportion to his native ability, his scientific attainments, and his unswerving loyalty to his own convictions. You cannot reason with a closed mind, especially if that mind, conscious of its rectitude, is conscious also of its power to enforce its views; and history teaches only too well the meaning of the words *vae victis*. Belgium has covered herself with undying glory; but that fact has not saved from death or from a life that is worse than death thousands of Belgian men, women, and children. In *Culture and Anarchy*, Matthew Arnold quotes two excellent rules of Bishop Wilson: "First, never go against the best light you have; secondly, be sure that your light be not darkness." Unless one is an incurable egotist—I admit that there are still in the world thousands of this type—this second precept will ultimately lead one into the ways of social open-mindedness and release from slavery to one's own point of view, however sincerely held.

To develop this large sympathy with the tragedy and comedy of human life, to enable one to understand the appeal to others of ideas with which one cannot one's self agree, to help one to incarnate in one's behavior, especially toward opponents, the winning power of one's ideals—this is the true fruit of the study of the great classical writers. It is unfortunately possible, as Germany has conclusively demonstrated, to gain from this study an invaluable mental discipline and knowledge of ancient history, and yet fail altogether to receive that fine tempering of the spirit which is its most precious result.

At the close of the examinations last June one of the readers in his report to me dwelt at some length upon the disturbing fact that on the average not much more than one-half of the candidates in all subjects secured 60 per cent or higher. He closed by saying: "I feel more and more every year that it is not the intellectual part that fails so much as it is the moral training in a broad sense. Results are poor in earnestness, ambition, persistence, etc. That is what makes the trouble." This diagnosis seems to me to be sound. It may perhaps be urged in extenuation that we have in America what Sir Michael Sadler once wittily called a "pedocracy," and that it is by no means easy to convince our young rulers of the practical value of our teaching for their daily lives. Latin, in particular, appears to be somewhat remote, and they bear with our instruction rather out of courtesy than because of any real belief. But the horrors of this war are making even young minds serious, and if the arguments that I have been presenting to you are valid we may justly entertain a lively hope of being able to commend them *virginibus puerisque*. We are fortunate in the two authors whom we study with them intensively. For Cicero was, in the words of Augustus as Plutarch records them, "*Λόγιος ἀνήρ, ω παῖ, λόγιος, καὶ φιλόπατρις*," "A great orator, my child, a great orator, and a man who loved his country," and of Vergil, Bacon's description is still true, "The chapest poet and the royalest that to the memory of man is known." But let us never forget that the most effective way to propagate the spirit of liberalism is to express it in one's own daily life and conversation, both in and out of the classroom.

In his essay "On the Training of Children" Plutarch quotes a saying of Democritus: *λόγος γὰρ ἔργου σκιή*, "the word is the shadow of the deed." One may grant the close association and yet note that words, like shadows, have a fatal power to obscure at times the real situation. One need not go outside of the apologetics of the present war to find warrant for the supposition that inability to frame a plausible argument in support of any contention whatever indicates a certain lack of brains. But dangerous as words are constantly proving themselves to be, we cannot dispense with their use. Prudence, therefore, as well as idealism, urges insistently the study of words and their uses. I commend again to your prayerful meditation, as I did last year,¹ the value of working in concert with the teachers of English. The Board's entrance examination in English literature is based upon two most interesting lists of books, with all of which we teachers of Latin should be acquainted. It would at least be easy for us to make ourselves quite familiar with the particular books in these lists that were being studied in the English classroom by the members of our classes in Latin. We could then by explicit references and quotations co-ordinate the work of the two classrooms, making clear to our pupils the availability of their English reading for the translation of Latin into English. Through this definite and detailed use of the English lists we should presently be able to prove to our colleagues that we were giving them effective help. I venture to believe that they would be most appreciative. It is perhaps unnecessary to add that if, instead of convincing *ourselves*, we could convince *them* of the value of Latin for English diction and style by such practical demonstrations we should gain very powerful support for our subject in the high-school course.

There is, of course, encouraging evidence that good work of this general kind is already being done. Let me give you some renderings of parts of the passage from the *Aeneid* set last June for translation at sight:

"Aurora, meanwhile, had ushered in for miserable mortals the blessed light, bringing back tasks and hardships."

¹ "Lessons to Be Learned from the Results of the College Entrance Examinations in Latin," *Classical Journal*, XII (1917), 575-84.

"Meanwhile Aurora had revealed her kindly light to unhappy mortals, bringing back their work and their hardship."

"Many are the bodies of the cattle that are sacrificed to Death, and they slaughter at the fire bristly boars and sheep taken from all the fields."

"Thrice about the blazing fires girt in shining arms they wheeled, thrice the sad funeral fires they rounded upon their chargers and raised a cry of lamentation. Sprinkled is the earth with tears and sprinkled also are their arms; there rises to heaven the warrior's wail and the trumpet's shrill voice."

Consider the pleasure that this last example gave to a reader who had got wearily accustomed to renderings like this:

"Thrice all ran down the burned piles with gleaming arms, three times they showed the sad funeral fire to the horses and gave a yell from their mouth. Both the earth is spattered with tears and the arms are scattered about. It goes to heaven and the clamor of men and the braying of trumpets rises."

If in these examinations the translations, on the whole, are acceptable rather for their accuracy than because of any noticeable literary quality, what shall we say of spelling? One of the readers sent me the following list: torchered, gaurd, godess, growning, emperers, sacrifice, proberbly, snached, egar, emphysises. The new New York state syllabus for the first two years of Latin lays very great stress upon the relation of Latin words to their English derivatives, and we are all familiar with the valuable work which Mr. Albert S. Perkins is doing in the Dorchester High School. Here, beyond question, is a second field in which we can earn the gratitude of our colleagues in English by helping them to solve one of their most difficult problems. The phenomena of the life and growth of language, if they are properly presented to young minds, are surely as entertaining as the life and growth of plants; and this knowledge is far more relevant to the practical needs of daily life. Let me plead again, as I have done in the past, for greater attention to the family relationships of words. Last June, within the area of Latin itself, 154 candidates out of 388 could not form from the verb *audivisse* a Latin noun denoting the agent, and 69 out of the same number were unable to explain at all the derivation of *civitas*. Yet the knowledge called for was of the most elementary character.

Through the kind co-operation of Professor Fiske and the office of the Board I am again able to present to you several tables of

statistics. They are entirely similar in their general character to those of the last three years. The first table indicates, as heretofore, the relative proficiency in prepared work and in sight work of the candidates who offered 4 (Cicero and sight) and 5 (Vergil and sight). The supplementary sections (Table IA, p. 666) are concerned with those candidates who *pass in one part only* and owe their ultimate success or failure in the examination as a whole to the greater power of the part in which they pass or fail. Table IA therefore presents in another form the results already indicated in the last four columns of Table I (p. 666). You will note that a trifle under three-fourths of the candidates in Cicero and in Vergil pass, if competent, in both parts independently, but, if incompetent, fail in both parts independently. In 1914 and 1915 this was true of almost exactly three-fourths of the candidates in both subjects, and in 1916 of 65 per cent in Cicero and almost 84 per cent in Vergil. This substantial agreement for four successive years seems to me rather striking and encouraging. If now we consider the candidates who passed in one part only, the figures for 1917 are so strikingly different from those for the previous years as to suggest the question, Were the sight passages perhaps too easy, or was the prepared work somewhat hurriedly done in order to gain time to develop the power to translate at sight?

In considering the comparative success of the candidates in dealing with prescribed work and with sight translation, we should not forget that questions on the subject-matter form an important part of the first half of the paper. It is clear from the figures in Table II (p. 667) that the performance in this part of the examinations last June was not very encouraging, especially when I remind you that the group of pupils here represented is formed, as in previous years, of the candidates sent by several schools whose records in Latin as a whole are very good. Let me add some figures indicating the treatment of the questions without reference to such a special group. In the following questions the number of answer-books stated after each question received no credit at all.

On Cicero *Pro lege Manilia* 65, 66 (1,390 candidates):

What objections to the appointment of Pompey had been urged by Catulus and Hortensius? How does Cicero meet these objections? 362.

TABLE I

	Passed Parts I and II	Failed Parts I and II	Part I Passed Part II Failed Passed on Whole	Part I Passed Part II Failed Passed on Whole	Part II Passed Part I Failed Passed on Whole	Part II Passed Part I Failed Passed on Whole
LATIN 4. 1,379 CANDIDATES						
Number.....	577	430	46	38	170	118
Percentage.....	41.8	31.2	3.3	2.8	12.3	8.6
LATIN 5. 1,160 CANDIDATES						
Number.....	565	263	15	9	225	83
Percentage.....	48.7	22.7	1.3	0.8	19.4	7.1

TABLE IA

SUBJECT	PASSED ON WHOLE							FAILED ON WHOLE													
	Total Number	Success Due to Sight Translation			Success Due to Prepared Work			Total Number	Failure Due to Sight Translation			Failure Due to Prepared Work									
1914	1915	1916	1917	1914	1915	1916	1917	1914	1915	1916	1917	1914	1915	1917							
4.....	150	176	313	216	72.0	61.9	10.9	78.7	28.0	38.1	89.1	21.3	87	15650	649.6	95.7	24.4	449.4	450.4	4.3	75.6
5.....	97	120	127	240	84.5	77.5	63.0	93.7	515.5	52.5	37.0	6.25	54	80	9222.2	31.2	40.0	9.877	868.8	90.0	90.2

TABLE II

Subject	Number of Candidates	Passed Prescribed Translation	Passed Questions	Passed P. T. and Q.	Failed P. T. and Q.	Passed P. T. Failed Q.	Failed P. T. Passed Q.	Passed P. T. 45-59 in Q.	Passed 4. 28.4
4.	215	91.2	53.0	89.3	52.1	7.9	39.1	0.9	31.7
5.	161	87.0	46.6	88.8	46.6	13.0	40.4	0.0	

TABLE III
All Candidates

Subject	Number						60-100						60-50					
	B	7S	11S	x6S	B	7S	11S	16S	B	7S	11S	16S	B	7S	11S	16S		
1,197	133	196	248	57.6	90.2	87.2	86.3	17.3	4.5	4.6	5.2	25.0	5.3	8.2	8.5			
2,922	99	152	222	58.2	90.0	88.2	84.7	12.5	5.0	5.9	9.0	29.3	5.0	5.9	6.3			
3,1,738	225	325	485	50.6	89.8	88.0	80.8	14.8	3.5	5.2	10.5	34.5	6.7	6.7	8.7			
4,1,618	147	221	343	58.6	78.2	78.7	77.3	14.4	8.9	7.7	9.3	27.0	12.0	13.6	13.4			
5,1,244	541	69	93	106	54.9	94.2	91.4	90.6	14.2	9.2	3.2	30.9	2.9	5.4	5.4			
6,1,321	111	200	289	68.2	85.6	82.0	83.4	11.0	8.1	9.0	8.0	20.8	6.3	9.0	8.6			
7,1,021	92	139	171	55.1	84.8	72.7	75.4	13.2	7.6	15.1	13.5	31.6	7.6	12.2	11.1			

Explain the point of the distinction made in the last sentence of this passage between *imperatoris aut legati* and *tribuni militum*. 629.

On Cicero *Pro Archia* 26, 27 (1,390 candidates):

Explain briefly Cicero's argument in this passage. 503.

Who was Ennius? For what was he famous? 401.

What two contrasts are made in the sentence beginning with *Quare?* 467.

On Vergil *Aeneid* i. 469-78 (672 candidates):

What is the connection of this passage with the story of Book i? 214.

What story is referred to in *priusquam . . . bibissent?* 324.

On Vergil *Aeneid* iv. 465-73 (398 candidates):

What is the connection of this passage with the story of Book iv? 119.

Tell briefly the two tragic stories referred to in 469-73. 207.

Who are meant by Tyrios? 148.

On Vergil *Aeneid* vi. 867-74 (274 candidates):

About whom is Anchises speaking? 127.

Rewrite *ne quaere* in the form of expression which is most common in prose. 89.

In what way was Rome the *Mavortis urbs?* 130.

Why did Vergil put into his epic the story of Book vi? 53.

The scansion of two simple verses was asked for. Only 205 candidates out of 757 received full credit, and 184 made such mistakes that they received no credit at all. Yet this is the one and only question whose presence on the paper in Vergil is absolutely certain.

Were there then no answers which showed that the writer could think? Let me give you a few which cheered us:

"Pentheus, king of Thebes, because he refused to allow the worship of Bacchus was made to see double by that god and was finally torn to pieces by his mother and sisters at a Bacchic revel."

"Orestes, son of Agamemnon, murdered his mother Clytemnestra to avenge his father whom she had killed. He was pursued by the furies for a long time, but was finally judged innocent by the council of the Areopagus at Athens. Minerva cast the deciding vote in his favor. Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides have all written on this theme."

"Eumenides was a euphemistic name given to the Furies to appease them. It means kindly-minded ones."

"Eumenides—a word of Greek derivation meaning the 'well wishers.' The ancients had this name for the Furies because they feared to anger them by calling them their real names. The Eumenides correspond most nearly to the modern conscience."

"The word Eumenides means well-wishers, the exact opposite of what the Furies were. The ancients called the Furies Eumenides because they thought

by calling them that name they would ward off their wrath, just as one says 'nice doggie' to an ugly brute coming at him."

"Vergil must have had many reasons for introducing into his epic the story of Book vi. The book serves to acquaint the people of the age with life after death. It shows the various punishments of the wicked and the blessings of the good. Vergil here shows how closely he can imitate Homer in Homer's book the *Odyssey*. The book serves as a very interesting diversion in the main story. It gives Vergil an opportunity to praise the glory of Rome and its rulers, and thus obtain honor for himself. Here he flatters Augustus Caesar, so that on the whole the story of Book vi was written with many purposes."

In this connection I wish to express the concern of the readers at the persistence of the idea that Vergil "flattered" Augustus.

In Table III.(p. 667), of which I now ask your consideration, you will find the Board's general figures for Latin (all candidates) set in comparison with the combined record of seven, eleven, and sixteen schools whose candidates as a whole achieved marked success. With one exception, due to the substitution by one of the sixteen schools of the comprehensive for the regular examinations, the schools are the same that were represented in this table last year. The figures given under the caption B are taken from Professor Fiske's report for 1917.

Certain things are clear. In the first place, the percentages of the groups of schools are in substantial agreement with one another, and are all far higher than the general percentages of the Board. In the second place, the number of candidates sent by the group of sixteen is, in each examination subject, a very considerable fractional part of the total number examined by the Board in that subject. As this table has told the same tale for four successive years, it is, I think, quite clear that under favorable educational conditions it is possible for the schools to attain notable success in the examinations of the Board.

LESBOS IN THE TROJAN WAR

BY EMILY L. SHIELDS
Smith College

Professor Manatt, when referring in his recent book, *Aegean Days*¹ to Lesbos in Sappho's time, says, "The fair isle, now the Garden of the Turkish Empire, was then the Garden of the Greek world." Even before his book was published he might have added, "And now again has become the Garden of the Greeks." For at the close of 1912 the Greek fleet landed troops, forced into surrender the garrison of the Turks who had held power for more than four hundred years, and soon the Greek flag waved over Lesbos. What the new era will bring is not yet determined. But this recent surrender into Greek control, occurring on the border of an unrecorded future, sends our thoughts back three thousand years to that other transition to Greek power, occurring on the border of an unrecorded past, when a people who had been subject to Priam and an island which had been an outpost of Troy first came into Greek control through the might of Achilles. This recent conquest was easily made, being only an incident in a much greater war. Likewise the first invasion was part of a larger contest. But what were the sufferings of Lesbos in that early Trojan War we may be enabled to realize in a slight degree by the trials of some border state, some small ally, in our own time. And though in the pages of the *Iliad* the name Lesbos is seldom mentioned the tendency of modern investigation is to bring the island into ever greater prominence among the events of the long siege of Troy.

"And seven women will I give, skilled in excellent handiwork, Lesbians whom I selected for myself when he [Achilles] took well-built Lesbos, surpassing womankind in beauty," says Agamemnon briefly of the subjugation.² Leaf, in his *Troy, a Study in Homeric Geography*,³ assumes that these lines refer to some Homeric or pre-

¹ P. 298.

² *Iliad* ix. 128-30.

³ P. 242.

Homeric source dealing with a great foray of Achilles along the southern Troad to the very head of the Gulf of Adramyttium—a raid in midsummer, when Achilles took with him a large force, including at least all the fifty ships of the Myrmidons and between three thousand and six thousand men, and a subsidiary fleet of cargo ships, *νῆες φορτίδες εὐρεῖαι*,¹ in which to bestow his abundant booty. "It is evident," he states, "that Lesbos is here a town, and does not mean the whole island, which is far too big to be conquered as a mere incident in a more serious war." Leaf is not wholly satisfied, however, with this part of his theory, as is shown by this further statement, "But we have no tradition to tell us of any town once called Lesbos. If we may guess, let us fix on Methymna, the second city of the island—in full sight of the mainland, at a distance of twelve miles, so that it may well have tempted Achilles. It hardly lay out of his path for the return." But the Garden of Priam, the whole island with its wealth and fertility, would naturally be the goal for such an expedition, and references elsewhere show that the time spent by the Greeks in Lesbos is greater than that allowed for by the hurried foray of Leaf's.

At the other extreme is the belief of those who claim that the struggles of the Aeolians for possession furnished material for the saga and the epic and were shifted to the old famous capital of the country, the fortress of Priam, though they really were fought about the islands Lesbos and Tenedos and the Gulf of Adramyttium, which were first reached by the Aeolians. Of the real scene of the contest intimations have survived in the episodes of the attempts of Achilles against Lesbos and the cities Thebes, Lyrnessus, Pedasus, Chryse.

Achilles, in the twenty-fourth book of the *Iliad*,² said to Priam, "of thee, too, aged man, they speak as rich in former days, when all that Lesbos, seat of Macar, holds was thine and all that Phrygia and the boundless Hellespont contain." In summing up the wealth of Priam it is significant that Lesbos, rich in olive groves, grain fields, and vineyards, and its seven ancient cities should be put first. The very epithet *Μάκαρος ἔδος* is appropriate because of its important colonist, Macar, the blessed one; as, for instance, Diodorus³ explained the name, "The islands fanned by the winds and giving

¹ *Odyssey* v. 349; ix. 322.

² *Iliad* xxiv. 543-45.

³ *Diod. Sic.* v. 82.

healthful climate to the inhabitants, and rich in crops, abounded in plenty, and soon made the men who lived there prosperous; and so they were called the Islands of the Blessed, *μακάρων νῆσοι*, the abundance of good things giving rise to the appellation."

The attributive *ἐνκτιμένη*, "well built," applied to Lesbos in the passage which Leaf quotes, can apply to the whole island as well as to a single town. For instance, *νῆσος ἐνκτιμένη* occurs in the ninth book of the *Odyssey*¹ of the island of the Cyclopes—a fitting parallel to *Λέσβος ἐνκτιμένη*.

After the sack of Troy, Nestor and Diomedes and Menelaus put in at Lesbos to plan their course homeward.² So in the voyage to Troy, a first and easy landing place would have been offered by the island with its bays and harbors. And as a military post it would prove invaluable. With Lesbos in the hands of the enemy at their rear, the Greeks would have everything to fear. With it in their own possession they were sure of a base of supplies, plentiful and near at hand.

Even in pre-Homeric times Lesbos seems to have contained many cities. Thus Macar is said to have had many sons and daughters, the eponymous heroes and heroines of the towns. To wrest such a territory from Phrygian rule seems to have been largely the work of Achilles, according to traditions which center about his name. And especially do such traditions connect him with Methymna in the northern part of the island. Here Lampetus and Hiketaon are said to have been slain by Achilles and to have become local heroes. Here, likewise, according to Parthenius,³ when Achilles was carrying off spoils of war from Lesbos Trambelus opposed him and fell. Achilles in admiration of his bravery asked him who he was, and learning that he was son of Telamon he wept for the deed and built a great mound on the shore where is the *heroon* of Trambelus. Another story is localized at Methymna, which says⁴ that when Achilles sailed and plundered the islands along the mainland he put in at Lesbos; and there he sacked each of the cities but was not able to take Methymna. Then Peisidice, daughter of the king, seeing him from the wall, sent a promise of

¹ *Odyssey* ix. 130.

³ Parthenius—*Erotic Experiences* xxvi.

² *Ibid.* iii. 169.

⁴ Parthenius *op. cit.* xxi. 1.

surrender, for which he straightway agreed to marry her. When, however, he had control of the city he ordered his soldiers to stone her to death. Such was the story of Peisidice—a parallel to that of the maid of Pedasus.

But other Lesbian maidens in Homer escaped death only to fall into captivity. “Seven women will I give, skilled in excellent handiwork, Lesbians selected for myself when he himself took well-built Lesbos, surpassing womankind in beauty. These I will give, and with them there shall be she whom once I took from him even Briseis,”¹ says Agamemnon in his message to Achilles. But here arises a problem debated from antiquity. Was Briseis included among the seven Lesbian maidens? Aristarchus thought not and compared the passage in *Iliad* xix. 245, where the women are not designated as Lesbian,

ἐξ δ' ἄγον αἵψα γυναικας δμύμονα ἔργα ιδνίας
ἔπτ', αὐτὰρ ὁγδοάτην Βρισηΐδα καλλιπάργον.

Here with other appropriate changes Zenodotus read ξ instead of $\epsilon\pi\tau'$, which Düntzer regarded as an *infelicitissima emendatio*; and so it is. But in the opinion of Zenodotus $\muετά δ' \epsilon\sigmaσεται$ (*Iliad* ix. 131) can be understood only as “among them there shall be.” Zenodotus entertained the idea that Briseis was among the seven Lesbian maidens in Book ix, and conformity of the two passages was his goal, even at the cost of reckless emendation in Book xix, and in spite of the fact that the Catalogue says Briseis was from Lyrnessus on the Trojan mainland. This was the opinion of Aristarchus. But the most important weapon against the view is *Iliad* ix. 638. When Achilles resisted all persuasion of Odysseus and Phoenix, Ajax turned angrily and reproved the son of Peleus about wrath for one maiden when they furnished seven. And if Briseis was not among those who surpassed she must have been among the $\phi\tilde{\imath}\lambda\gamma\eta\alpha\iota\kappa\omega\nu$, and so was excelled by the seven maidens—an unfitting admission in the case of the Cause of the Wrath—subtly argues Tümpel.² He claims that in the later Book xix the maidens lacked the special designation Lesbian because of a migration to the mainland about 700 B.C., when the colonies

¹ *Iliad*, ix. 128–32.

² *Philol.*, 1889, pp. 106–10.

changed the original Lesbian myth and disarranged the tradition. Lyrnessus of the Catalogue was also thus explained. According to the earlier story it is not without point that Diomede, a Lesbian maiden, should console Achilles for the loss of Briseis. Wilamowitz¹ discovered that Briseis is not, properly speaking, the daughter of Briseus so much as the girl from Bresa, i.e., from a town in south-western Lesbos, where exist today a promontory Brision and a village Brisia. Connected with this promontory in ancient times was the worship of Dionysus *Brisaios*, said by the Aeolians to have originated through Macar the colonist and priest of the god. The cult seems to have flourished there for many centuries, for an inscription of the fourth century B.C. records a dedication of Dionysus *Bresagenes*, and there Koldewey found a simple Doric *templum in antis* of Hellenistic times.

Wilamowitz noted that the poet of the oldest part of Book i (one of the oldest parts of the *Iliad*) knows only of a κούρη Βρισῆς, and a scholium to line 392 supplemented the name of the κούρη Βρισῆς with Hippodameia. It is probable that the maidens were called from the names of their homes, as was the custom among slaves, Getis, Cilissa, etc. This leads to the belief that these seven captives were symbolic of the same number of Lesbian towns taken by Achilles and given to Agamemnon. Achilles (ix. 328) boasted "twelve cities with my ships have I laid waste, and with my soldiery eleven in fertile Troyland." Of the twelve cities subdued Tümpel considers that one was Tenedos, the other eleven Lesbian. Dictys,² though not trustworthy, names Pyrrha and Hierapolis as conquered by Achilles. Nine other early Lesbian towns are after a wide search found by Tümpel. Still the towns of the seven Lesbian maidens are as impossible to identify as before.

"Surpassing womankind in beauty" says the poet. Has the statement any reference to the Lesbian Καλλιστεῖα, a contest of beauty, well-established in later times and doubtless of primitive origin? Preller, Gruppe, and others think this contest pre-Homeric and a pattern for the judgment of Paris. Contests of women concerning κάλλος were held among the people of Tenedos and Lesbos just as those of σωφροσύνη and οἰκονομία were celebrated in other

¹ *Homerische Untersuchungen*, pp. 409 f.

² Dictys ii. 16.

places, on the ground that beauty must also be held in honor.¹ "Come to the gleaming shrine of Hera, the ox-eyed, Lesbian maidens with dance," is the beginning of a Lesbian epigram on the festival.² Hesychius called the maidens who won Πυλαιτίδες, from which it is likely that the contest was held near Mytilene, since Pylaeum was a mountain just north of the city. Pylaeus was also the name of a Pelasgian leader in the Trojan War, and in fact the custom appears to have been Pelasgian.

The tradition of seven Lesbian maidens seems to have run through both pre-Homeric and Hellenistic story. Myrsilus the Lesbian knew of seven Lesbian muses—in this case also slaves—³ for he said that Macar, king of the Lesbians, was always quarreling with his wife. Megaclo, their daughter, was therefore sorry for her mother and bought the muses as handmaidens. These she taught to play on the cithara the deeds of olden times. They thereupon charmed Macar and put an end to his rage, and for this Megaclo dedicated a thank-offering to them of a bronze stele, giving command that they be honored at all the shrines.

A colonization story twice given by Plutarch⁴ said that an oracle directed that when those who were to settle Lesbos should meet with a reef called *Mesogeion* they should throw to Poseidon a bull and to Amphitrite and the Nereids a living maiden. The lot fell to the daughter of Smintheus, one of the seven leaders. But a certain Enalus of noble birth loved her and leaped into the sea to save her. In this story again appeared seven unmarried daughters.

As late as the third century the tradition of the seven Lesbian maidens survived. According to Hyginus,⁵ Conon, the astronomer, desiring to win favor with Ptolemy claimed that the hair of Berenice was placed among the stars and indicated seven stars which he imagined to be that hair. Eratosthenes⁶ said that Conon also requested that the dowry which no one would pay to the Lesbian maidens be paid. Now the scholium, Germanicus, *Arati Phenomena*, p. 72, l. 19, says, "Videntur aliae iuxta caudam eius (leonis) stellae obscurae septem, quae vocantur crines Berenices Εὐεργέτιδος

¹ Athenaeus xiii. 610.

⁴ *Sept. Sapient. Conviv.* 20; *De Sol, Animal* 36.

² Anthol. Pal. ix. 129.

⁵ Hyginus, *Poet. Astron.*, ii, 24, p. 67.

³ Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* ii. 31.

⁶ *Ibid.*

et dicuntur earum virginum quae Lesbo perierunt." Tümpel¹ is convinced that the seven stars must represent the seven Lesbian maidens who belong to the Achilles story. Homer told the reason for the loss of the dowry, i.e., the capture by the Greeks—and so a constellation was the mythical reparation for the seven luckless maidens. But by the astronomer Conon they were robbed of their last consolation for the sake of a compliment to Berenice. In the poem the maidens implored the proud Berenice to give back at least the dowry.

The continuity of the tradition from Homer to Myrsilus was preserved by Attic comedy.² Pherecrates in the *Chiron*³ refers to Homer in the lines

δώσω δέ σοι γυναικας ἐπτά Λεσβίδας
καλόν γε δῶρον, ἐπτ' ἔχειν Δαικαστρίας.

Tümpel emphasizes still more the importance of Lesbos by considering Chryseis as also a Lesbian. And though Leaf disregards the theory certain pages of his *Troy*⁴ are really an argument in favor of it. For one has only to read his section treating of the location of Chryse to become dissatisfied with each of the proposed localities on the mainland. Thebe is the place of capture, Chryse the birthplace of the maiden, and therefore ancient commentators argued for the proximity of the two places.⁵ But in the words of Leaf, "They do not conceive it possible that any Homeric lady could have been staying fifty miles away from her father's home. What Pelasgian rules of etiquette for unmarried ladies may have been we nor Strabo can well say. But what right have we to assume that she was unmarried?" Leaf convincingly refutes the old argument of Strabo to prove the town as modern Chryse, at the head of the Gulf of Adramyttium. The harbor at Hamaxitos is another site in question, and this he decides is too small and not particularly deep, though it gives a fair shelter in most winds to fishing boats of

¹ Roscher, *Lexikon der gr. und röm. Mythologie*, s.v. "Lesbierinnen."

² Eust. 741. 22 and Schol. Aristophanes *Frogs* 1308.

³ Attributed also to Nicomachus and Plato.

⁴ Leaf, *Troy*, pp. 228-34.

⁵ Schol. BD. A 336 says, for instance, that she was taken in Chryse in connection with the storming of Thebe.

the neighborhood, and is certainly the most marked bay for some distance along this exposed western coast. At one time, therefore, he rejected Hamaxitos and considered Sevrigi, eight miles east of Cape Lekton. "It is in fact the only natural harbor in the Troad," he says. But after his visit to the place in May of 1911, his belief was much weakened, and "On the whole," he concludes, "I must now range myself on the side of Hamaxitos."

Stephanus told that a place, Chryse, existed in Lesbos. It is true that the lines of the *Iliad*, "Hear me, God of the silver bow, who guardest Chryse and holy Cilla and rulest Tenedos with might, O Smintheus," indicate that Chryse must lie near Cilla, and on this Strabo¹ insisted. But there seems to have been a *Cillaion* in Lesbos and a worship of Apollo *Cillaios*. The principal material for locating Chryse was furnished by the *Presbeia* of Odysseus,² in which is described a place within easy sail of the mouth of the Scamander, with a deep harbor, and with an altar of Apollo quite close to the harbor itself; on the west coast of Lesbos is the Gulf of Callone, which most fitly answers these conditions. Also the name Smintheus is Lesbian by the use both of tradition and epigraphy. Smintheus was the leader of a colony to northwestern Lesbos and προφήτης Σμυνθέως is read on an inscription preserved near Methymna, in the same part of the island. We know from Herodotus that Arisba, on the Gulf of Callone, was destroyed and the inhabitants transferred to Methymna. At Arisba was perhaps the early *Smintheion*. Apollo *Smintheus*, the protector against field mice, seems to have had early worship in the island. There is evidence also for an early deity, Chryse. In fact Cleanthes of Assos, near Lesbos, said that Aphrodite Chryse was worshiped in Lesbos. Tümpel thinks she is perhaps related to Aphrodite *Callone* of Samothrace, a name which perhaps survives in the designation of the Lesbian bay.

The leap into the water of the daughter of Smintheus³ is elsewhere attributed to Aphrodite, as in Rhodes, or to Sappho, whose biography is so closely linked with the Aphrodite story. The love of a youth is in both cases contained in the theme. In the same

¹ Strabo xiii. 613 C.

² *Iliad* i. 430 f.

³ Plutarch *Sept. Sapient. Conviv.* 20.

strain is the story told by Parthenius of the Lesbian Apriate, who was beloved by Trambelus and threw herself into the sea. This name Apriate reminds us of the lines in Book i of the *Iliad*,

πρίν γ' ἀπὸ πατρὶ φιλῷ δόμεναι ἐλικώπιδα κούρην
ἀπριάτην ἀνάποινον, ἦγεν θ' ερήνην ἑκατόμβην
ἐς χρυσῆν.

Aristarchus pronounced ἀπριάτην an adjective, Crates of Pergamum an adverb, and Euphorion a substantive. Tümpel in agreement with Euphorion identifies Chryseis with Apriate with Aphrodite Chryse of Cleanthes, with the daughter of Smintheus. However that may be, there is a tradition of Chryse and Aphrodite Chryse in Lesbos which may have been in the mind of the older poet of the *Iliad*.

Returning to the question of Cilla, Strabo¹ said that there was a temple of Apollo in the island; and tradition connects the founding of this Lesbian temple with the story of Pelops. When the latter buried his charioteer, Cillus, he built a sanctuary by the grave, calling it that of Apollo *Cillaios* because of the sudden death of Cillus. A scholium to Euripides' *Orestes*, (1. 990) (Munich) calls Oenomaus king of the Lesbians, and Tantalus is also said to have had a hero's shrine in the island. Either Lesbos was the early home of the Pelops story and Hippodameia was a bride seized from Lesbos² or the Lesbian Pelopidae later imitated the celebrated Olympian myth with the use of local tradition.³ Robert believes that the shrine of this Cillaean Apollo may have been an out-chapel of the Sminthian god. Apollo was the important deity of Lesbos in pre-Homeric times, Pelops an important name in the tradition of the Pelopidae, and another story⁴ connects them. The oracle of Apollo *Napaios*, near Methymna, gave response to Pelops,

ὦ βούλομαι δός, μὴ δᾶσον δ' ὃ μὴ θελω.

The oracle in iambic trimeter is doubtless spurious, but the very existence of the story indicates that an oracle of Apollo was early established in northern Lesbos.

¹ Strabo xiii. 612.

³ Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.*, p. 145, n. 9.

² Robert, *Bild und Lied*, p. 187.

⁴ Schol. Aristophanes *Clouds* l. 144.

If the Lesbian oracles served the Achaeans well the island was early subjugated. Philostratus tells of an oracle which the Greeks at Troy received about Philoctetes and the bow—an oracle from Lesbos. He adds, "Since Lesbos was distant only a short distance from Ilium, the Achaeans sent to the oracle there—the oracle of Orpheus." It is evident that Orpheus and Apollo were associated locally in the giving of prophecy. Lucian said that the lyre of Orpheus was put in the temple of Apollo and for a time kept safe there, and Ovid said that once Orpheus was protected from a serpent by Apollo. They say that once Orpheus was wont to rejoice in prophecy before Apollo gave his attention to it. For since men no longer went to Gryneum, but Orpheus alone gave prophecies—his head having just come from Thrace—the gods stood over him as he prophesied and said "Cease from the things that belong to me, for enough have I borne with thee and thy singing."¹ Stories vary in detail about the head and lyre, and Miss Harrison² thinks that the lyre was probably a later decorative addition to an old head oracle story. At any rate the shrine of Orpheus later enjoyed considerable fame and is said to have sent responses not only to neighboring Ionians but even to Babylon.

Apollo was conspicuous not only for his oracles but also for his service of purification to the Greeks, if any confidence can be placed in the statement of Arctinus³ that Achilles sailed to Lesbos and sacrificing to Apollo and Artemis and Leto was purified of the murder of Thersites. But, as Leaf⁴ says, this idea of purification from blood is one of which Homer knows nothing and must probably be regarded as creeping into later tradition.

Pre-Homeric Lesbos was sometimes given the name Pelasgia, and as Pelasgian was certainly under the protection of Zeus. Macar was called the grandson of Zeus himself. Aside from Pelasgian names, which still survived in the island in classical times, writers continually testify to its Pelasgian settlement. Of the colonization Diodorus Siculus gives the fullest account, saying that Xanthus, son of Triopas, with Pelasgians from the Peloponnesus,

¹ Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* iv. 14; Lucian. *Adv. Induct.* 11 f.

² *Proleg. to Gr. Religion*, pp. 465–67.

³ *Aethiopis*, *Epic. Gr. Frg.*, p. 33 (Ki).

⁴ *Troy*, p. 308.

took possession of Lesbos, formerly without inhabitants. Seven generations later it was stripped of population by the flood of Deucalion. Then came Macar.¹ The conquest during the Trojan War seems to have prepared the way for a line of future settlements by the family of Agamemnon. For according to Diodorus, a descendent of Orestes, generally believed to have been Pentilus, went to Boeotia, then to Euboea and Lesbos. Afterward came Gras and Malaus and Cleues, all descendants of Agamemnon. The Penthelids were a powerful family there in the time of Pittacus. Though these leaders are reputed to have come from the Peloponnesus they gathered their bands in the north and went from northern Greece. The settlements seem to have been peacefully made in consequence of the earlier conquest by the Achaeans.

In the words of Sir Gilbert Murray,² "If we look for some great traditional meeting place of the descendants of Agamemnon from the south and those of Achilles from Thessaly, the first place to suggest itself is the island of Lesbos. The time and place at which the main strands of the *Iliad* must have come together are fairly clear. The time is the Aeolian migration, the place is Lesbos or some early settlement on the shore of Asia." A convincing proof that it was Lesbos seems to be in the fact that the colonization was all from Lesbos to the mainland. Though Mytilene and Methymna owned many colonies in the Troad, the continent held no possessions in the island.

We should like to believe with Fick³ that probably Homer sang the *Iliad* here in the Aeolic metropolis, and with Kock that Sappho's Lesbian singer, *πέρροχος*, *ώς ὅτ' ἀσιδός οἱ Λέσβιοι ἀλλοδάποισιν*,⁴ was Homer and not Terpander. "In the wandering of the children of Agamemnon to Lesbos," says Manatt,⁵ "the minstrel of that long march, like the leader, may have given place more than once to a son and successor; but they were all Homers and the Homer that finally arrived was ripe for an *Iliad*. He had seen snow-clad Olympos and the waving forests of Thessaly; he had breasted the wild rivers and roamed the wild hills of Thrace; he had dreamed on

¹ Son of Crinacus, Diodorus v. 81; son of Helius, v. 56.

² *Rise of the Greek Epic*, pp. 202-3.

³ *Die Homerische Ilias*, pp. 108-9.

⁴ *Sappho* frg. 90.

⁵ *Aegean Days*, p. 273.

Troy's walls and flowery Scamander; and now here (in Lesbos) with many-fountained Ida looming ever in his sight he struck up to sing the glory of his race."

"Dawn in its saffron robes spread over the sea,"¹ says Homer. Hence some infer composition on an island with sunrise over the water. Manatt² in his travels there thought that Lesbos yielded more than one bit of local color; for instance, he noted the "saffron-robed dawn" only in Lesbos, and once he saw it rising over the sea as Homer described it. Homer's *κροκόπεπλος ήώς* is akin, he says, to Sappho's *χρυσοπέδιλλος αὔως*.

Lesches of Pyrrha in Lesbos probably wrote the *Little Iliad*; but the *Iliad* as we know it was doubtless composed after the tide of colonization passed from Lesbos to the continent. Nevertheless there is influence and material of an older time when the Achaeans were making their first important subjugation of the island. Certainly the worship which lingered about the *heroa* of Achilles, Palamedes, Trambelus, and Lampetus indicates it. And evidence that Lesbian cities were stormed, men slain, captives taken, oracles consulted, abounds in the later tradition. The Greek army under other famous leaders besides Achilles seems to have entered on a long campaign there. Menelaus exclaims,³ "Would that Odysseus should come among the suitors in such might as when of old in well-built Lesbos he rose up and wrestled with Philomeleides and threw him mightily, and all the Achaeans rejoiced."

Lesbos, conquered during the Trojan War, continued to be held by the Greeks for nearly twenty-five hundred years. Now after about four hundred years of Turkish rule the island belongs to the Greeks once more. And that it may remain in the possession of the people through whom it attained the height of its glory is probably the wish of us all.

¹ *Iliad* xxiii. 227 and xxiv. 13.

² *Aegean Days*, p. 274.

³ *Odyssey* iv. 342.

ACHILLES AND THE ARMOR OF PATROCLUS

By JOHN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

In the *Iliad* (xviii. 170 ff.) Iris came to Achilles and urged him to rescue from the hands of the Trojans the body of Patroclus, showing the disgrace which would be his if insults were heaped upon the corpse of his friend; Achilles replied that he was helpless, for his own armor was now in the possession of the enemy and he could use the armor of none except perhaps that of Ajax, the son of Telamon, but as that warrior was himself in the thick of the fight he could not hope to secure it, so that he would be able to do nothing, for it would be impossible to fight without armor.

The scholiast to this passage made the obvious inference that the armor of Patroclus should fit Achilles, for his armor had fitted Patroclus, and so accordingly he asked the question, "Why did Achilles not make use of the armor of Patroclus?" This question is answered by saying that Automedon probably wore the armor of Patroclus, so that while Patroclus passed for Achilles, Automedon in his turn passed for Patroclus. This answer, we are told, is due to Crates, the rival of Aristarchus, and it is brought forward by Thiersch (*Ueber das Zeitalter und Vaterland des Homer*, p. 56) as a striking proof of the unusual ability of Crates as an interpreter of Homer.

It is impossible to define accurately the position held by Patroclus in the army at Troy, as he seems a sort of supernumerary in the camp, and he is of importance only as a companion, a friend, or a servant of Achilles; therefore he seems to have had no occasion to use arms, except for the one brief period when he employed, not his own armor, but that of Achilles. Patroclus plainly joined the Greek forces to serve and to advise Achilles, but not to fight the Trojans.

When Andromache told of the death of her father she added with something like satisfaction that he had been honorably treated

by Achilles, who burned his body together with his armor and then erected a funeral mound. The fact that she should at this moment recall with pride that her father's arms had gone with him to the pyre shows the high importance in which this honoring ritual was held. The passage is found in the *Iliad* vi. 415 ff.

Odysseus was met at the entrance to Hades by the shade of Elpenor and was begged to search out the dead body at the halls of Circe, to burn it along with the armor which had belonged to Elpenor, and after the burning to erect a mound in his honor near the shore of the sea:

λ 74: ἀλλά με κακῆισι σὸν τεύχεσι, ἄσσα μοι ἔστιν,
σῆμά τέ μοι χεῖαι πολιῆς ἐπὶ θυὶ θαλάσσης.

As soon as Odysseus and his companions returned from Hades they burned Elpenor and his armor, according to his prayer. Evidently the obligation was too sacred to be ignored.

We have abundant evidence from the shaft graves in Mycenae that the warriors who lived before the age of Homer were honored by the placing of armor with them at their burial, and we know that in the ages after Homer such a tradition survived by the fact that Sophocles in his *Ajax* makes the hero command his son, Eurysaces, to preserve for himself the great shield, but to send with his father to the grave the rest of his armor (*Ajax* 577). This command was faithfully executed, as verses 1407 f. of the same play show.

Virgil also felt that the honor of burning the arms or the characteristic implements of the dead was an essential trait of the heroic age, that is, the age pictured in the *Iliad*.

Aen. vi. 212:

Nec minus interea Misenum in litore Teucri
flebant, et cineri ingrato suprema ferebant.
principio pingue taedis et robore secto
ingentem struxere pyram, cui frondibus atris
intexunt latera, et ferales ante cupressos
constituant, decorantque super fulgentibus armis.

232: at pius Aeneas ingenti mole sepulcrum
imponit, suaque arma viro remunque tubamque,

Evidently this last verse was suggested by the preparations for the pyre and the mound in honor of Elpenor.

The funeral procession in *Aen.* xi. 91 ff. and the funeral rites xi. 194 show the same custom of burning the armor with the fallen. Virgil at least believed that in the age pictured by Homer the warrior took his armor with him to the pyre.

The preparations for burning the body of Patroclus, Ψ 161 ff., are described at great length and with a thoroughness of detail hardly to be equaled in the *Iliad*. The pyre was one hundred feet in length and one hundred feet in breadth; on this the corpse was placed, in the hands of which Achilles had put the hair shorn from his own head; the body was then covered from head to foot with the fat of sheep and of kine, the carcasses of which were heaped about; then large jars of honey and of ointment were stood next to the bier, and four spirited steeds were thrown on the pyre. Patroclus kept nine dogs as his own pets, two of whom were killed and put beside their master, and last of all twelve goodly and noble youths of the Trojans were slain and added to the funeral pile. But from first to last there is not the slightest reference to armor of any sort.

While as a rule it is dangerous to draw arguments from silence, yet the length of the description and the multiplicity of details prove beyond question that the omission is not due to accident and that no armor was put on the pyre of Patroclus.

When the shade of Patroclus came to visit the sleeping Achilles, xxiii. 66, there were no marks of a warrior about it, although it bore all the features of the living friend and was dressed with the accustomed clothing, but this shade, unlike that of Elpenor, mentioned no armor.

The fact that no armor was put on the pyre of Patroclus and that no mention of his armor is made in any part of the *Iliad* can explain fully the failure of Achilles to make good the loss of his own armor by using that of his friend and companion.

It may be argued that Hector had armor, yet no mention of burning his armor on the pyre is found in the description given of his funeral, but the entire account of the pyre and the burning of Hector occupies but a single line,

Ω 787: ἐν δὲ πυρῆι ὑπάτῃ νεκρὸν θέσαν, ἐν δ' ἔβαλον πῦρ.

"On the top of the pyre they placed the corpse and kindled the fire." There is nothing to show either that the armor was burned with him or that it was not. In the case of Achilles, whose death came in the interval between the action of the *Iliad* and that of the *Odyssey*, we assume from the story of the contest over his arms and the resulting suicide of Ajax that his arms were not burned, but these arms were not destructible and were made by Hephaestus himself, so that they would naturally be spared the fate of ordinary armor.

We have in Homer two positive examples of the honor done the dead by burning his armor with him, one in the words of Andromache, the other in the prayer of Elpenor, and we have one certain example of a person with whom no armor was burned, the example of Patroclus. Hector and Achilles furnish no proof either way.

Everything in the *Iliad* indicates that Patroclus had no armor and did not come with Achilles in the character of a warrior. A recognition of this fact will immediately clear up all the confusion which the critics have found in the story of the exchange of armor.

The suggestion that Patroclus assume the part of a warrior came from Nestor, and to encourage him he added that the Trojans would think he was Achilles and would not fight; this would give the Greeks a chance to rest, and then refreshed they could force the exhausted enemy back to the city—that is, it would not be necessary for him to fight at all and the mere presence of the Myrmidons would decide the contest (Δ 795 ff.). This assumed fright of the Trojans was intended as an argument for Patroclus to induce him to become a warrior. Diomedes, Odysseus, and Agamemnon had just been wounded, and Nestor in despair felt that any sort of assistance was welcome. When Patroclus came back to Achilles he repeated the words of Nestor, for it was imperative that he also be persuaded; hence the arguments which appealed to Patroclus were used with him. Achilles did not tell Patroclus that one could fight better in his accustomed armor, for he knew that Patroclus had no armor of his own, so he said to him:

II 64: τὸν δ' ὄμοιν μὲν ἐμὰ κλυτὰ τεύχεα δῦθι,
ἄρχε δὲ Μυρμιδόνεσσι φιλοπτολέμοισι μάχεσθαι.

The argument that the Trojans would think that Patroclus with the armor of Achilles was Achilles himself and so would flee was intended in the first place to induce him to fight and then was used by Patroclus to get the consent of Achilles, so that when its purpose was gained and when Patroclus appeared in battle it was practically ignored.

The whole device of the exchange of armor is a clever piece of poetic economy by which Achilles is given a dignified excuse for casting aside his anger and appearing again in the center of the battle. Patroclus, the gentle and kindly companion, is at a time of crisis put in armor, given a brief glory, and slain, so that the action of the *Iliad* and the wrath of Achilles may not remain permanently deadlocked.

The pathos which accompanies the death of such a person on the field of battle is superbly expressed in II 856:

ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ρεθέων πταμένη "Αἰδόσδε βεβήκει,
δν πότμον γούωσα, λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ηβην.

"And his spirit passing from his body, went to Hades, lamenting his fate, leaving his manliness and his youth." This is in keeping with the fact that the adjectives most used to describe Patroclus are *ἐνηής, μείλιχος*; hence the urgings of Menelaus "Now let each one remember the gentleness of poor Patroclus, for he knew how to be kindly towards all."

P 670: νῦν τις ἐνηίης Πατροκλῆς δειλοῖο
μνησάσθω· πᾶσιν γὰρ ἐπίστατο μείλιχος εἶναι.

We know from Nestor that when his father sent Patroclus along with the Greeks he explained that his part was to restrain, to advise, and to encourage Achilles, but he said nothing to him of his duties as a warrior.

The tragedy of the *Wrath* is that it should have forced this man to his death, and in borrowed armor.

Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

SIMILES IN HOMER AND IN VIRGIL

It is a commonplace of Homeric scholarship that there are far more similes in the *Iliad* than in the *Odyssey* and that this fact has been pressed as an argument for a diversity of origin or of authorship. Finsler in his *Homer*, pp. 328 ff., places special emphasis on this chorizonic test. In a review of this book written for *Classical Philology*, X, 237, I wrote thus: "Professor Finsler lays stress on the fact that the *Iliad* has so many more similes than the *Odyssey*. The reason is evident; the *Iliad* has a theme most difficult to enliven or to diversify, the constant repetition of battles, military movements, and single combats would be tiresome indeed were the story not told with a wealth of poetic adornment, while the varied events of the *Odyssey* need no such embellishment." According to this reasoning it was diversity, not of origin, but of theme which influenced the number of similes. It has occurred to me that perhaps Virgil might throw some light on this matter, for the *Aeneid* in a general way follows the story of the *Odyssey* in the first books, the story of the *Iliad* in the last books. If the theme is really the decisive matter, then the descriptions of battle should have more similes than those of wanderings and adventures on sea and land. In Virgil's *Aeneid* any difference of usage must have some other explanation than diversity of authorship.

The third book of the *Aeneid*, describing the wanderings and adventures of Aeneas from the time he left ruined Troy until he landed on the shores of Africa, near Carthage, is strictly Odyssean in tone and in context, and this book of 718 verses has but a single simile, 679 f.

No book of the *Aeneid* is wholly given over to fighting, but the twelfth corresponds most nearly to the great battle scenes of the *Iliad*, and this book has eighteen similes. Book xii has 952 verses, that is, it has one simile to each fifty-three verses, while the average of the entire *Iliad* is one simile to each seventy-eight verses.

The table of similes as given by J. A. Thomson, *De comparationibus Vergili-anis*, shows that in Virgil the fighting scenes make free use of similes, while the scenes of travel and adventure use them very sparingly. This is a pleasing confirmation of the contention that the difference in the use of similes as shown in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* was due to diversity of theme, and is no proof of diversity of authorship.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

CICERO'S HEXAMETERS

In the *Classical Journal* for April, 1918, a reviewer speaks of "Cicero's unhappy poetic efforts," and probably the greater number of his readers took no exception to this verdict pronounced upon the poetic effusions of Rome's great orator. But we must remember that even the scanty survivals of Cicero's verse are not fairly represented by the unlucky

fortunatam natam me consule Romam;

nor by the only less criticized

cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi (linguae?)

He was certainly not a poet, yet, like some other men who have gained a thorough command of the resources of their native tongues, he could write eminently respectable verse, judged by metrical standards; more than that, he exerted a distinct and favorable influence on the development of the dactylic hexameter in Latin.

The evil that men do lives after them,
The good is oft interred—

in the back numbers of some learned publication. What I have said of Cicero's verse would be obvious to anyone who had read the careful and sympathetic analysis of his hexameters, published by Professor Tracy Peck in *TAPA*, XXVIII, 60 ff. But since I have been unable to recover the reference which many years ago called my attention to Professor Peck's paper, I suspect that I might cull material from it to embellish this note without serious risk of being convicted of plagiarism. But I prefer to be honest and to do Cicero and the readers of the *Journal* the greater service of making that article better known.

We should probably all accept the verdict of Quintilian on the second of the two lines of Cicero which I have quoted and that of Juvenal on the first; but I should like to make one comment upon them which is original so far as my reading goes. Cicero's allusions and quotations show that he was well read in the poetry of Greece and of his native land, and that he had a good ear for rhythm and assonance seems to be beyond question. He therefore must have written these two lines deliberately, either because he believed with Ovid "decentiorem faciem esse, in qua aliquis naevos fuisset" (*Sen. Contr.* ii. 2. 12); or because, like some of the *poetae neoterici* of the present day, he aimed at arresting the attention of his reader, or hearer, by eccentricity of diction; in other words, at making him "sit up and take notice." That this ill-starred venture is probably largely responsible for the caustic comment of Tacitus (*Dial.* 21) as well as for concealing the orator's real contributions in the field of versification from many modern students of Cicero should be a warning to those who, either in prose or in verse, yield even occasionally to the temptation to write "ea quae mirentur potius homines quam intellegant" (*Suet. Aug.* lxxxvi. 2).

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THREE MORE NOTES ON THE AGRICOLA

Cap. 36. 3: "Minimeque equestris ea enim pugnae facies erat, cum egra diu aut stante simul equorum corporibus impellerentur.

In this perverted sentence the corruption is so aggravated that it could not occur at a single transcription. Following the only line of correction untried by previous editors we retain *enim*, which is hard to eliminate entirely, and explain as follows: by haplographical error *minimeenimequestris* became *minimeequestris* with *enim* written above by corrector and later inserted wrongly after *ea*; then by dittography *minimeequestris* became *minimequeestris*. For *egra diu aut stante* we propose *e gradu aut statu*, both of these words being amply exemplified as military terms in the lexicons, though not in combination. As for interpretation, Tacitus is writing biography, not history, and describes the battle to show how Agricola won victory by a strategy quite displeasing to his staff. As a minor motive he takes a sidelong fling at Caesar's extravagant praise of the horsemanship of the chariooteers (*B.G.* iv. 33), whose charge proved to be disastrous only to their own, in spite of the initial victory over the cavalry, which is naturally not stressed. Omitting the *ut* inserted in the previous sentence by the editors we would translate: "In the meantime, our cavalry being routed, the chariots essayed to take part in the infantry battle and, although shortly before they had created panic (among the cavalry), they nevertheless came to grief on account of the dense throngs of the enemy and the broken ground; for this phase of the fighting was anything but an exhibition of horsemanship since, whether standing still or on the move, they were alike bowled over by the impact of the horses' bodies."

Cap. 44. 4, 5: "Filia atque uxore superstibus potest videri etiam beatus incolumi dignitate, florente fama, salvis adfinitatibus et amicitiis futura effugisse."

"Nam sicut durare in hac beatissimi saeculi luce ac principem Traianum videre, quod augorio votisque apud nostras auris ominabatur, ita festinatae mortis grande solacium tulit evasisse postremum illud tempus."

This ancient puzzle solves itself if we note the strophic arrangement, the poetical diction, the tragic obscurity, and the heightened style. We would read *durare in hac . . . luce* with the MSS like *durare in partibus* and *durare in obsequio* (*Ann.* 2. 76; 4. 18). This is poetic diction but so is the author's use of *durare* in general for *vivere* or *manere*; note also *hac* for *huius* like Virgil's *decus hoc aevi* (*Ecl.* iv. 11) for *decus huius aevi*. Moreover by virtue of the strophic arrangement, since *filia atque uxore superstibus* is amplified in the *sicut* clause, *durare* here equals *superstites esse*. To be noted also are the parallel poetical infinitives *futura effugisse* and *evasisse postremum illud tempus*. Translate: "His wife and daughter being alive today, he may even be regarded as genuinely fortunate to have escaped impending events while his eminence was unquestioned, his reputation unimpaired, his kinsmen and friends unharmed.

"For as it has proved a signal compensation to be alive in the splendor of this blessed age and to witness the principate of Trajan, which often in our hearing he predicted and devoutly desired, so it has proved a signal compensation for his untimely death that he forestalled those last evil days."

Cap. 45. 1: "Mox nostrae duxere Helvidium in carcerem manus; nos Mauricum Rusticumque *divisimus*, nos innocentii sanguine Senecio perfudit."

So the editors. Yet the MSS give *nos Maurici Rusticique visus*. These genitives are too hard to eliminate and may be saved by reading *noster*, which parallels *nostrae* above and has been wrongly assimilated to the following *nos*. This finds strong confirmation in the following *videre et aspici*.

N. W. DEWITT

VICTORIA COLLEGE
TORONTO

General Comment

[Edited by Gilbert Campbell Scoggin, The University of Missouri.]

Dean Henry Parks Wright, of Yale College, died on March 18. During the Civil War he served among the Massachusetts volunteers. He entered Yale in 1868 and was graduated four years later at the head of his class. He was made tutor in 1870, assistant professor in 1871, and professor in 1876. In 1884 he was appointed dean, and this position he held until he retired in 1909 after service of a quarter of a century. Wright Hall, one of the dormitories at Yale, was erected in his honor by his old students and admirers. His name is widely known among college students of Latin through his edition of Juvenal's *Satires* issued in the "College Series of Latin Authors."

Professor James Rignall Wheeler, of Columbia University, died February 9, 1918. He was graduated from the University of Vermont, where his father was president, in 1880 and received his Ph.D. at Harvard in 1885. He was among the first students to be enrolled at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, which was opened in 1882. In 1886 he was lecturer at Johns Hopkins University and was instructor at Harvard in 1888-89. From 1889 to 1895 he was professor at the University of Vermont. He was then called to Columbia as professor of Greek. In 1906 he was appointed professor of Greek and archaeology. Together with Professor H. N. Fowler, of Western Reserve University, he was author of the widely used *Handbook of Greek Archaeology* published in 1909.

The pamphlet dealing with the Princeton Conference of last June has recently appeared in its fourth issue. The first three printings, comprising 11,000 copies, were rapidly exhausted and it was found desirable to reprint an additional issue of 5,000 copies. It contains opinions of President Wilson, of ex-Presidents Taft and Roosevelt and former President Cleveland, and of Messrs. Lansing and Root. To the question, "Is Latin dying out in the schools?" the answer is given, "For the last twenty-five years the study of Latin in the secondary schools of the country, far from diminishing, has been growing rapidly. Next after English, history, and algebra, which are required of practically all high-school pupils, Latin has now the highest enrolment of any secondary-school subject." There are remarkable and reliable statistics showing the great superiority of classical over non-classical students in college-entrance examinations. No less remarkable is the continued superiority of the

classical students in college studies and intellectual student activities. Included also is Professor Adriance's statement as to Dr. Flexner's wilful or ignorant misuse of statistics. Copies of this important pamphlet may be secured from Dean Andrew Fleming West, of Princeton University. The volume on the *Value of the Classics* also was reprinted in January.

The farcical nature of many so-called educational tests is convincingly exposed by Professor H. C. Nutting in *Education* for February. In his article "Experimental Test of Educational Values" he shows how utterly without scientific method or understanding a recent writer in a journal of high standing and of wide circulation had "proved" that in the high-school curriculum Latin did not "function." Professor Nutting shows how this writer starts with two doubtful assumptions (and just now the scientific educator must be on his guard against treacherous assumptions no less than against illogical deductions). In the first place, it is assumed that a subject does not function if it does not "impart to the student *permanent* ability to do further work in the same department." Twenty years later the student may have forgotten most of the rules of his Latin grammar, since he has not found constant application of them in his daily work. Hence Latin does not function. In the second place, it is assumed that a subject against which a student rebels does not function. The pupil should "take" to a subject that functions. The purpose of Professor Nutting's paper, however, is to expose the writer's method of showing how Latin does not function. That method consisted in setting before about thirty pupils in all, at various times and places, a Latin sentence taken from a modern writer. The sentence reads as follows: "Studium discendi voluntate quae cogi non potest constat." This brief sentence contains unusual syntax and word-meaning. By the end of his third year, in the course of the usual reading, the pupil will have had this meaning of *constat* with the ablative just once (*Pro Archia* 8. 18). What could be expected at the end of the first or second year? Professor Nutting shows how a reference to Lodge's *Vocabulary* and to Byrne's *Syntax* would have prevented such a blunder on the part of a capable examiner. In *School and Society* for February 2 Professor Nutting aims some very well-directed shafts at various weak points in President Eliot's latest paper issued by the General Education Board.

The February number of the *Alumni Register* of the University of Pennsylvania contains an article by Professor G. D. Hadzsits on "The Value of the Classics in Modern Education." The author maintains that "of the many reasons why the classics still appear essential for our modern education the first and foremost is that they may serve to hold in check the tide of vocational studies that is setting in so strongly. Not that these and all they stand for are not of greatest importance for our educational system as a whole, but that in a

natural spontaneous enthusiasm for them proper regard for cultural studies may be engulfed." The fact is rightly emphasized that there is no inherent hostility between vocational and cultural training. But the obvious immediate advantages arising from the former often cause them to be welcomed by parents and school administrators to the neglect of the latter. On the other hand, intellectual training derived altogether from literary studies may lead to a detachment from real life and even to "intellectual snobbery." There should be a mutual regard for values; and both forms of training should be at the disposal of all citizens in a democracy. Professor Hadsits discusses two special phases of classical studies, their disciplinary and their cultural value. He argues that even in a strictly vocational school the classics have a place to fill, for of late stress has been laid upon content no less than upon drill for discipline. Yet the discipline is always there. "The finality of paradigms is an absolute barrier to grotesque feats of intellectual cleverness, howsoever entertaining such may be; and a merciless Nemesis is forever at the heels of those who take undue liberties with the facts of language and who would escape the connective processes involved in the refined work of correct translation." Then too, "if the practical value of the subject consists of an indispensable service to literature and language, to history, to law, to religion, philosophy, consists of service to the man of letters, to the historian, the lawyer, the priest, and the philosopher, it behooves the classicist to seize upon the argument of practicality with intense and sure imagination if he would equip himself with the most valuable persuasion against attacks of vocationalism." Our present civilization is unintelligible without a knowledge of the past. Architectural tradition confronts us on every side; engineering feats, concrete structure, rhythm, and folk dancing have their basis in the past. Our great systems of railways have their origin in the ancient avenues of trade. Current literature resounds with echoes of the past. "The biologist would but incur ridicule who did not interpret physical man in terms of evolution." A modern school in a true democracy must make this continuous development clear, and it should not allow vocationalism to drive out cultural studies.

In his recent edition of the *Eclogues* of Faustus Andrelinus, Professor Wilfred P. Mustard, of Johns Hopkins University, makes a third contribution to his *Studies in the Renaissance Pastoral*. He edited, in 1911, the *Eclogues* of Baptista Mantuanus and three years later the *Piscatory Eclogues* of Jacopo Sannazaro. The introduction contains a brief but interesting account of the life and works of Andrelinus together with criticisms passed upon him by contemporary and later scholars. Born in Italy in 1462, Andrelinus had distinguished himself as a poet before the age of twenty-two and was looking forward to a teacher's career. He finally settled in Paris and became a famous lecturer on poetry in the University. He was intimate with Erasmus and his

name is not infrequently mentioned by the latter with praise. Beatus Rhenanus, in his life prefixed to Froben's edition of the works of Erasmus, says that Andrelinus lectured in a rather superficial manner, "jocis quibusdam magis festivis quam doctis plausum rudium auditorum captans." One of the most playful letters of Erasmus is written from England to Andrelinus:

Sunt hic nymphae divinis vultibus, blandae, faciles, et quas tu tuis camoenis facile anteponas. Est praeterea mos nunquam satis laudatus. Sive quo venias, omnium osculis exciperis; sive discedas aliquo, osculis dimitteris; redis, redundunt suavia; venitur ad te, propinantur suavia; disceditur abs te, dividuntur basia; occurrit alicubi, basiatur affatim; denique quoconque te moveas, suaviorum plena sunt omnia. Quae si tu, Fauste, gustasses semel quam sint mollicula, quam fragrantia, profecto cuperes non decennium solum, ut Solon fecit, sed ad mortem usque in Anglia peregrinari.

Any mention of the name of Andrelinus calls to my mind a joke once played upon him by a very clever wag, an acquaintance of Erasmus. This rascal composed, under the title *Cygnus moriens pro specu*, an epigram containing a *specious* echo. It ran as follows:

Tempora fatalis quoniam sic limitis itis,
Tristia concentu funera solor olor.

With this he rushed away to an expert copyist, who wrote out the distich in a very antique form. Our wag then visited the learned professor of poetry and showed him this beautiful fragment just found among some ancient manuscripts. In the words of Erasmus: "Legit iterum atque iterum Faustus, et difficile dictu, quam stupuerit quamque exosculatus sit, quam pene adoraverit doctam illam et inimitabilem antiquitatem. Nec finis nec modus admirandi antiquitatem, donec ipse Santeranus sui proditor, rem omnem in risum verteret." Professor Mustard in his notes has been very keen in scenting out the imitative passages of his poet. Of course there are very numerous reminiscences of Virgil and Ovid and several from Horace, Juvenal, and Persius. He seems to have been particularly familiar with Calpurnius and Nemesianus, poets not much read then—or now. Specimens of their verse may be most conveniently consulted in Mr. Garrod's *Oxford Book of Latin Verse*. Andrelinus does not seem to have greatly influenced his successors. The chief exception seems to be Ionnes Arnolletus, whose four *Eclogues* Professor Mustard has included in his volume. The classical student will derive much pleasure in reading through the notes. Even a very casual dipping into the book will reveal the great superiority of Andrelinus over his imitator.

Book Reviews

The First Year of Greek. By JAMES TURNY ALLEN. New York:
Macmillan, 1917. 12mo., pp. ix+375. \$1.30.

The history of the Greek primer in America during the nineteenth century is a tale of restriction of the field up to a point where finally the whole attention was directed to one work of a single author. Our grandfathers began their reading with two books, the *Greek Testament* and the *Graeca Minora*, which contained selections from Aesop, Hierocles, Lucian, Plutarch, and Xenophon (*Cyropaedia*), not to mention *Anacreontics*, Alexandrian idyls, and *Cebes' Tablet*. In our day the pupil's efforts were confined to four books of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, for which the way had been carefully prepared by a beginner's book with vocabularies and exercises especially designed for training in Xenophon's military vocabulary. The last years have witnessed a reaction in the direction of the older method. There has arisen a demand for a richer, more varied course, a course which shall be not only a preparation for later reading but in some sense an end in itself. At the same time there has appeared, with the introduction of elementary Greek into the college curriculum, a maturer class of pupils with linguistic faculties already trained.

Professor Allen's *First Year of Greek* seeks to meet this situation. The book has been developed, he tells us, from a series of lessons and exercises, prepared more than eight years ago and annually revised with successive classes, till they have been used with more than three hundred students, by five different teachers, both in preparatory school and college. The general program of this course was set forth in an article in the *Classical Journal*, X (1915), 262-66. The book aims at being an introduction, not to Xenophon's *Anabasis*, but to Greek literature. We begin as did our grandfathers with the introductory verses of the *Gospel of John*; and we meet passages from the *New Testament* here and there throughout the volume. Here too are fables from Aesop and *Anacreontics*, as in the old *Graeca Minora*. Here are passages of considerable length from Plato, Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, Herodotus, and sentences from Aristotle, Plutarch, Epictetus. We may open our eyes a bit at the appearance of three propositions from Euclid in the earlier part of the course; but a little examination shows how admirably adapted the geometrical demonstration is to illustrate the uses of the Greek moods and the meaning of sundry particles, as well as to give practice in the inflections of the voice which accompany these. Verse is not neglected. Short quotations from the tragedians, proverbs from Menander and the New Comedy, snatches from the *Anthology* and the old lyric poets, are a prominent feature. Pains also are taken that the student should

know something about these manifold authors whose words he finds before him. Early in the course his attention is directed to a vocabulary of proper names at the end of the book, where the necessary information is provided in a convenient form. No opportunity is lost to bring about familiarity with Greek terms, letters, numerals. Thus the titles of the lessons and of their various parts are given in Greek and their numbers are indicated by the alphabetical symbols as well as the Greek names. Capital letters appear constantly. A number of inscriptions of various periods serve to prevent erroneous impressions as to the way in which Greek was originally written. A grammar of over a hundred pages makes up the second part of the book. There is also a series of ingenious exercises, which supply stimulating hints as to methods of instruction. On the conclusion of these eighty lessons the student will not only have had a thorough course in the grammatical forms of the language, but will have come into contact with a great wealth of Hellenic ideas from many authors and many periods.

S. O. DICKERMAN

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

The Greek Genius and Its Influence: Selected Essays and Extracts.

Edited, with an Introduction, by LANE COOPER, PH.D., Professor of the English Language and Literature, Cornell University. Yale University Press. \$3.50.

This book is of especial interest to students of the classics as originating in the mind of one interested, not in ancient languages primarily, but in English and the influence of ancient literature upon English. In editing this composite work Professor Cooper has shown a true eye for literary value by the scope and repute of the sources drawn upon. Jebb, Gildersleeve, Rand, Gilbert Murray, Croiset, August Boeckh, and von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff are names that speak well for content, and the whole prose structure is illuminated with extracts from such poets as Wordsworth, Browning, and Milton. The editor's own Introduction has a fulness of vision that commends itself to the reader. C. G. Osgood's article on "Milton's Use of Classical Mythology" is not least in importance. Von Wilamowitz is always original and inspiring, making you think even though you disagree with his conclusions, and this short article is no exception. By far the longest of the selections is the editor's translation from Boeckh's *Encyclopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften*, which he considers "a touchstone for the worth of other characterizations of antiquity." It is by no means free from statements that have not stood the test of scholarship, and many would rank it much lower than has the editor, but that it is a work of value and importance no one would deny, and this translation should bring it within the easy reach of many to whom it would otherwise be inaccessible.

Rich in learning and interest as the book is, the fact remains that it is a composite work. In the words of the Preface, "An attempt has been made where possible to let one selection lead up to another, sometimes by a more superficial, sometimes by a deeper association of ideas." Yet in many cases this connecting thread is not at all easily discernible and the reader looks in vain for the helps that go to make a well-unified work. Again, one is thankful for the word of warning in the editor's brief footnote to the selection from Haigh's *Attic Theatre* on page 80, and the same is true of the five-line statement on the anachronisms in Cardinal Newman's *Attica and Athens*. But why stop there? And why not do as much in numerous other instances? The answer to this and the key to understanding the book as a whole is found in the editor's article "English Translations of Greek and Latin Classics" in the *Classical Weekly* of November 19, 1917. This article is a discussion and outline of his course in the English department at Cornell University, for which one of the purposes of the book is "to supply a part of the necessary background." It is no disparagement either of the book or of the course to say that a study of the outline shows how completely the book grew out of the course. In using it for such a purpose questionable statements for which we seek guidance are easily corrected and the lack of unifying elements is not a handicap. There is considerable justification too in the editor's hope that these differences and contradictions will be negligible in the generally true impression of the *Greek Genius* that grows on the reader. The book then will prove of value, not only to those who give courses in any way similar to Professor Cooper's, but also as a means of true perspective to the general reader and as a handy volume for those who desire to have in convenient form the best that is written on this subject.

VICTOR DWIGHT HILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained from Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City; F. C. Stechert & Co., 29-35 West 3d St., New York City.

BEARDSLEE, J. W. *The Use of Φόιος in Fifth Century Greek Literature*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 8vo, pp. 126. Paper, \$0.75 net.

BEST, SUSIE M. *Glorious Greece and Imperial Rome*. (World-Famous Stories in Historic Settings.) New York: Macmillan. Pp. 7+225. \$0.60 net.

BREWSTER, ETHEL H. *Roman Craftsmen and Tradesmen of the Early Empire*. Menasha, Wis.: G. Banta. 8vo, pp. 14+101. Paper, \$1.00 net.

CLARK, A. C., FREEMAN, C. E., and KING, J. R. *Cicero's Pro Lege Manilia, sive de Imperio Cn. Pompei Oratio*. Edited by J. R. KING, with notes by A. C. CLARK and a vocabulary by C. E. FREEMAN. (Oxford Classical Texts.) New York: Oxford University Press. 8vo, pp. 12+56. \$0.85 net.

GARDNER, PERCY. *A History of Ancient Coinage, 700-300 B.C.* With 11 plates. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 16+463. \$7.20 net.

MERRILL, W. A. *Parallelisms and Coincidences in Lucretius and Ennius*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology.) Vol. III, No. 4. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press. Pp. 249+264. Paper, \$0.20.

—. *Parallels and Coincidences in Lucretius and Virgil*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology.) Vol. III, No. 3, Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press. Pp. 135+247. Paper, \$1.25.

NUTTING, H. C. *Caesar's Use of Past Tenses in Cum-Clauses*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology.) Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press. Pp. 53. Paper, \$0.55.

PERKINS, A. S. *Beginning Latin Book*. (Students' Series.) Boston: Sanborn & Co. 12mo, pp. 22+432. \$1.20.

TYRELL, R. Y. *The Archarians of Aristophanes*. As played by the Oxford University Dramatic Society, with a translation into English verse. New York: Oxford University Press. 8vo, pp. 83. \$0.40 net.

VANNOY, C. A. *Studies on Athena Parthenos of Pheidias*. (Humanistic Studies, Vol. I, No. 5). Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa Press, Pp. 357. Paper, \$0.50.

GENERAL INDEX

	PAGE
A Day on Mount Eryx (W. H. Johnson)	37
A Family of Athletes (E. L. Green)	267
A French Schoolmaster's Method of Teaching Latin (Frances E. Sabin)	118
A Question of Emphasis (Campbell Bonner)	206
A Year—or More—of Greek (Clyde Pharr)	364
Achilles and the Armor of Patroclus (John A. Scott)	682
<i>Aere Conlato</i> (J. F. Ferguson)	515
An Author in Exile (Keith Preston)	411
Analysis and Interpretation of Conditional Statements (R. B. Steele)	354
Archaeology in 1916 (George H. Chase)	186
Cicero's Religious Beliefs (W. D. Hooper)	88
Content Studies and Content Teaching (Clyde Murley)	193
Cumae in Legend and History (Elizabeth H. Haight)	565
Daylight Saving in Ancient Rome (B. L. Ullman)	450
Did Homer Have an <i>Odyssey</i> in Mind While Composing the <i>Iliad</i> ? (John A. Scott)	607
Does the Style of the <i>Civil War</i> Justify the Doubt as to Its Authenticity? (Miriam Greene Paslay)	343
Dumnonix, A Play (Max Radin)	314
<i>Ecce! Caesar Vixit!</i> (Lena M. Foote)	447
Factors in Successful Teaching That Need to Be Stressed in Both High School and College (Leta M. Wilson)	476
Fourth-Year Latin (H. C. Nutting)	45
Glimpses of Roman Life as It Is Revealed to Us in the Literature (Charles C. Mierow)	592
Horace and Thackeray (Elizabeth Nitchie)	393
Horace on Contemporary Poetry (Tenney Frank)	550
Latin in the Grades Again (Anna S. Jones)	436
Lesbos in the Trojan War (Emily L. Shields)	670
Lincoln and Gorgias (Charles N. Smiley)	124
Notes on the Results of College Entrance Examinations in Latin (Nelson G. McCrea)	658
On the Force of <i>Hominis</i> in Caesar <i>B.G.</i> v. 58, 6 (B. O. Foster)	277
Pastoral Elements in the Greek Epigram (Charles E. Whitmore)	616
Q. Horatius Flaccus, Ph.D., Professor of Ethics (B. L. Ullman)	258
Roman Knowledge of Jewish Literature (Max Radin)	149
Rotation in Office in the Roman Republic (S. E. Stout)	429
Saving Latin by the Teaching of Latin (Frances E. Sabin)	468
Some Desirable Features of the Syllabus in Latin for the First Two Years (S. Dwight Arms)	96
Some Facts of Latin Word-Order (Arthur T. Walker)	644

	PAGE
The Athenian Ephebic Oath (John W. Taylor)	495
The Church Fathers and the Oriental Cults (Gordon Laing)	246
The Classical Reading League of New York State (Mason D. Gray)	III
The Classics and the Greek Writers of the Early Church: Saint Basil (Roy J. Deferrari)	579
The Conspiracy of Orgetorix—A Dramatization (Brita L. Horner)	61
The Curious Animals of the Hercynian Forest (Walter Woodburn Hyde)	231
The Enrichment of the High-School Latin Course (Myra H. Hanson)	55
The Importance of Good Teaching as a Basis for Lasting Interest in Latin (Jessie E. Allen)	470
The Journey Made by Telemachus and Its Influence on the Action of the <i>Odyssey</i> (John A. Scott)	420
The Needs of the Latin Teacher—after College (Lotta B. Liebmann)	491
The Needs of the Young Teacher—in College (Lucia C. Spooner)	483
The Present Status of the Problem of Races in the Prehistoric Aegean Basin (A. E. R. Boak)	25
The Problem of Language Study (George S. Painter)	629
The Second Necyia (Samuel E. Bassett)	521
The Teaching of the "Tenses" in Greek (George M. Bolling)	104
The Transition Period of Athenian Education and Modern Education (J. C. Morgan)	272
The Women of Caesar's Family (Monroe E. Deutsch)	502
The Works of Theodore Mommsen (Henry A. Sanders)	177
Titus Labienus (Frank Frost Abbott)	4
Two Julias (Payson S. Wild)	14
Via Nova—The Direct Method (H. C. Nutting)	200
Virgil and the Apocalyptic Literature (Norman W. DeWitt)	600
Votive Offerings and the War (Eugene S. McCartney)	442

BOOK REVIEWS:

Loeb, James, Translation of Legrand's The New Greek Comedy (Roy C. Flickinger)	77
The First Five Years of the "Journal of Roman Studies" (A. W. Van Buren)	139
Sandys, Sir John, Translation of the Odes of Pindar, including the Principal Fragments (G. C. Scoggins)	141
Souter, Alexander, and Mayor, John E. B., Translation and Annotated Text of Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticus (Elmer T. Merrill)	297
Cowles, Frank Hewitt, Gaius Verres: An Historical Study (R. W. Husband)	298
Bennett, Charles Ernest, Across the Years (M. N. W.)	301
Dean, Lindley Richard, A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions (E. T. M.)	302
West, Andrew F., Value of the Classics (M. N. W.)	302
Horner, Brita L., A Latin Sentence Game (F. J. M.)	303
Harvard Studies in Classical Philology (George E. Howes)	379
Moore, Clifford H., The Religious Thought of the Greeks (Gordon Laing)	383
D'Ooge, Benjamin L., and Eastman, Frederick C., Caesar in Gaul and Selections from the Third Book of the Civil War (Frank S. Bunnell)	463
Cumont, Franz, Études Syriennes (Grant Showerman)	464
Roberts, Arthur W., and Rolfe, John C., Cicero, Selected Orations and Letters (Benjamin L. D'Ooge)	541
Allen, James T., The First Year of Greek (S. O. Dickerman)	695
Cooper, Lane, The Greek Genius and Its Influence (Victor D. Hill)	696

GENERAL INDEX

701

CURRENT EVENTS

PAGE

Classical Associations and Meetings:	
Central Section of the Classical Association of the Pacific States	72
The Classical Department of the Louisiana State Teachers' Association	74
The Classical Association of the Pacific States	75, 130, 452
The Classical Association of Pittsburgh	131
Southern Section of the Classical Association of the Pacific States	285
The Iowa State Teachers' Association	286
The Western Massachusetts Section of the Classical Association of New England	287
The Latin Section of the Nebraska State Teachers' Association	288
A Latin Conference at Vassar College	289
The Latin Section of the Central Ohio Teachers' Association	290
The Classical Association of the Middle West and South	390
The Classical Association of New England	392
The Connecticut Section of the New England Classical Association	453
The Classical Section of the Indiana State Teachers' Association	454
The Tennessee Philological Association	456
The Classical Section of the Texas State Teachers' Association	457
Conference of the Latin Teachers of Iowa	531
Eastern Massachusetts Section of the Classical Association of New England	532
The Classical Association of the Atlantic States	535
The Latin Section of the Southern Wisconsin Teachers' Meeting	535
Classical Plays and Entertainments:	
Schlischer's <i>Andromeda</i> at Oakland	72
Miller's <i>Dido, the Phoenician Queen</i> at Harrisburg	73
A Roman Wedding at Waterloo	73
Miss Paxson's <i>A Roman School</i> at Iowa City	73
Tableaux from the <i>Aeneid</i> at Minneapolis	74
<i>Antigone</i> at Randolph-Macon College	76
<i>Menaechmi</i> at the Pennsylvania College for Women	131
<i>Antigone</i> at Sinsinawa College	131
<i>Coniuratio Oretorigis</i> at Litchfield High School	285
<i>The School Boy's Dream</i> at Minneapolis	288
<i>Saturnalia</i> at the University of Denver	452
Schlischer's <i>Soccus Malorum</i> at Michigan State Normal College	455
An <i>Auctio</i> at Bradley Polytechnic Institute	530
<i>A Roman Wedding</i> at Evansville	531
Schlischer's <i>Tirones</i> at Richmond	531
<i>Soccus Malorum</i> at Warren High School	534
Classical Societies and Clubs:	
The Latin Club of Central High School, Minneapolis	74, 288
The Columbus Latin Club	75, 290, 533
The Latin League of Wisconsin Colleges	76
"Latinae Sociae" organized at Jamestown	129
The Classical Club of the Pennsylvania College for Women	131
The Classical Club of Bradley Polytechnic Institute	285
The Classical Club of Cincinnati	290
"Sodalitas Latina" at Michigan State Normal College	455
The Latin Club of Hastings College	455
The Classical Club of the West Chester High School, the "Aeneadae"	534
Resolutions on Death of Professor A. S. Haggard	130
Classic Lands in War Time	132
Lectures on the Greek Drama by Professor Capps at the University of Wisconsin	291
Lectures on "The Roman Religion from the Monuments" by Professor Gordon Laing at the University of Michigan	455

	PAGE
Latin Formula for the Conferring of Degree at Princeton upon Students Leaving for War Service	456
Communication by Miss Sabin to School Principals and Latin Teachers of Wisconsin	457
 EDITORIALS:	
Absolute and Relative	1
Our Constitution	1
The Classical Conference at Princeton	81
Encouragement	145
Treasurer's Report	147
Pipes o' Pan	225
The Value of the Classics	229
Our Membership List	230
The Forty-ninth Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association	395
The Stupidest of Losses	309
The Classics in Translation	385
Scorning the Base Degrees	465
At Omaha	545
The Recent Meeting of the Classical Association of New England	547
In Place of German, What?	625
The Classical Association—Membership by States	627
Classical Conference at Pittsburgh	628
 GENERAL COMMENT	134, 218, 292, 375, 459, 536, 691
 NOTES:	
Mr. Maury on Achaian Greece (Walter Leaf)	66
The Leaf-Ramsay Theory of the Trojan War (W. M. Ramsay)	69
Three Notes on Tacitus' <i>Agricola</i> (Jefferson Elmore)	212
Odysseus Disguised as an Ancient Beggar (John A. Scott)	214
Bergk's <i>History of Greek Literature</i> (John A. Scott)	216
A Reminiscence of Herodotus in Matthew Arnold (Sidney N. Deane)	217
A Point in the Argument of Plato's <i>Apology</i> (Samuel E. Bassett)	282
Xenophon's <i>Anabasis</i> i. 5. 9 (G. C. Scoggin)	283
The Envy of the Gods in Homer (John A. Scott)	372
Lincoln and Gorgias Again (N. W. DeWitt)	373
Mr. Elmore's Three Passages of Tacitus' <i>Agricola</i> (N. W. DeWitt)	373
Quotations from the Bible in Roman Literature (Charles N. Smiley)	374
Roman War Bread (Monroe E. Deutsch)	527
Athena and the Adventures of Odysseus (Samuel E. Bassett)	528
On Subjunctive Conditions (Bernard M. Allen)	621
Two Corrections	622
Lincoln and Gorgias Once More (Charles N. Smiley)	623
Similes in Homer and in Virgil (John A. Scott)	687
Cicero's Hexameters (John C. Rolfe)	627
Three More Notes on the <i>Agricola</i> (N. W. DeWitt)	689
 RECENT BOOKS	80, 144, 224, 304, 544, 624, 698

Classical Association OF THE Middle West and South

Officers of the Association

President

CAMPBELL BONNER
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

First Vice-President

LOURA B. WOODRUFF
OAK PARK, ILLINOIS, HIGH SCHOOL

Secretary-Treasurer

LOUIS E. LORD
OBERLIN COLLEGE, OBERLIN, OHIO

Vice-Presidents for the States

ALABAMA	HORTENSE THORNTON	BIRMINGHAM
ARKANSAS	GUY A. SIMMONS	CONWAY
COLORADO	CHARLES C. MIEROW	COLORADO SPRINGS
FLORIDA	JOSIAH B. GAME	TALLAHASSEE
GEORGIA	E. K. TURNER	OXFORD
ILLINOIS	LOURA WOODRUFF	OAK PARK
INDIANA	FRANK H. COWLES	CRAWFORDSVILLE
IOWA	F. C. EASTMAN	IOWA CITY
KANSAS	O. G. MARKHAM	BALDWIN
KENTUCKY	M. A. LEIPER	BOWLING GREEN
LOUISIANA	EDWARD A. BECHTEL	NEW ORLEANS
MICHIGAN	CHEEVER HOYT	DETROIT
MINNESOTA	ARTHUR L. KEITH	NORTHFIELD
MISSISSIPPI	ALFRED W. MILDEN	SPRINGFIELD
MISSOURI	H. H. ARMSTRONG	OMAHA
NEBRASKA	SUSAN PAXSON	WAKEFIELD
N. CAROLINA	HUBERT M. POTEAT	FARGO
N. DAKOTA	GUY R. VOWLES	ALBUQUERQUE
NEW MEXICO	LYNN B. MITCHELL	CLEVELAND
OHIO	EDWIN L. FINDLEY	EDMOND
OKLAHOMA	O. W. JEFFRIES	SPARTANBURG
S. CAROLINA	MINNIE A. GEE	VERMILION
S. DAKOTA	J. H. HOWARD	KNOXVILLE
TENNESSEE	DAVID R. LEE	AUSTIN
TEXAS	DANIEL A. PENICK	SALT LAKE CITY
UTAH	ALICE E. ROWE	LYNCHBURG
VIRGINIA	HERBERT C. LIPSCOMB	MORGANTOWN
WEST VIRGINIA	CHARLES E. BISHOP	SUPERIOR
WISCONSIN	LUCIA SPOONER	SHERIDAN
WYOMING	IDA B. HULL	

Executive Committee

THE PRESIDENT, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT, SECRETARY-TREASURER,
AND

WILLIAM G. HALE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, ILL.

CHARLES E. LITTLE

GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE, NASHVILLE, TENN.

A. L. BONDURANT

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY, MISS.

J. B. PIKE

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

The Classical Association of the Middle West and South

is organized for the purpose of encouraging the development of the study of the classics; to provide a means of intercommunication between teachers of the classics—whether in the secondary schools, in the colleges, or in the universities of the territory it covers; and generally to promote a unity of thought and action in the broad field of classical teaching. Membership in the Association is open to all teachers of the classics and to other individuals interested in classical studies who reside in the territory covered by the Association. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year; \$1.25 of this amount covers the subscription to the *Classical Journal*, which is a special rate, the regular subscription price being \$2.50 per year. The value of the *Journal*, which is the official publication of the Association, to those interested in the classics, either as students or as teachers, cannot be measured by the annual outlay. The advantages involved in this offer should therefore appeal strongly to those who find themselves in this class.

Application for membership in the Association should be made to the Vice-President of the state in which the applicant resides (see list on page three of cover), or to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association.

A plan of co-operation has been perfected with the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association of the Pacific States. See second cover-page for directions relating to applications for membership.

